arXiv:1106.2014v2 [math.ST] 7 Oct 2011

Robust Adaptive Rate-Optimal Testing for the White Noise Hypothesis[1]

Alain Guay[2]

Emmanuel Guerre[3]

Štěpána Lazarová[4]

This version: 4th October 2011

---

[1] This is a revised version of a paper previously entitled 'Adaptive Rate-Optimal Detection of Small Correlation Coefficients'. The authors would like to thank two anonymous referees and an associate editor, Richard Davis, Marcelo Fernandes, Liudas Giraitis, Bruce Hansen, George Kapetanios, Remigijus Leipus, Peter Phillips and Aris Spanos for stimulating questions or suggestions. They would also thank participants of the Queen Mary Econometric Reading Group, 2008 Oxbridge Time Series Workshop, 2008 Vienna Model SelectionWorkshop, 2008 North American Econometric Society Conference and 2008 European Econometric Society Conference, York Economic Seminar Journées 2008 de Statistiques de Rennes, 2009 Bristol Econometrics Worshop, 2011 Brazilian Time Series and Econometrics School, LSE, Southampton, Warwick, Toulouse School of Economics and York Seminars. Last but not least, we would like to thank an anonymous Associate Editor and two Referees who have been very supportive and helpful to improve and clarify the paper. All remaining errors are ours. The first author gratefully acknowledges financial support of Fonds de recherche sur la société et la culture (FQRSC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). The last two authors are thankful for the financial support from the School of Economics and Finance of Queen Mary, University of London.

[2] CIRPÉE and CIREQ, Université du Québec à Montréal, e-mail: `guay.alain@uqam.ca`

[3] School of Economics and Finance, Queen Mary, University of London, e-mail: `e.guerre@qmul.ac.uk`

[4] School of Economics and Finance, Queen Mary, University of London, e-mail: `s.lazarova@qmul.ac.uk`

Abstract

A new test is proposed for the weak white noise null hypothesis. The test is based on a new automatic choice of the order for a Box-Pierce or Hong test statistic. The test uses Lobato (2001) or Kuan and Lee (2006) HAC critical values. The data-driven order choice is tailored to detect a new class of alternatives with autocorrelation coefficients which can be $o(n^{-1/2})$ provided there are enough of them. A simulation experiment illustrates the good behavior of the test both under the weak white noise null and the alternative. *JEL Classification*: Primary C12; Secondary C32. Keywords: Weak White Noise Hypothesis; HAC Inference; Automatic nonparametric tests; Adaptive rate-optimality.

1. Introduction

Testing for white noise is important in many econometric contexts. Ignoring autocorrelation of the residuals in a linear regression model can lead to erroneous confidence intervals or tests. Correlation of residuals from an ARMA model or of the squared residuals from an ARCH model can indicate an improper choice of the order. Investigating autocorrelation function is also a popular diagnostic tool in Macroeconomics and Finance, see e.g. Durlauf (1991) and Campbell, Lo and Craig MacKinlay (1997).

The earliest tests for white noise were based on confidence intervals for autocorrelation coefficients as described in Brockwell and Davies (2006) or Fan and Yao (2005). See also Xiao and Wu (2011) who recently derives the asymptotic distribution of the maximum standardized sample covariance of weak white noise processes. A second approach was established by Grenander and Rosenblatt (1952) who extended goodness-of-fit tests such as Kolmogorov and Cramér-von Mises tests to white noise testing. See also Durlauf (1991), Anderson (1993) and Deo (2000). Following the popular Lagrange Multiplier approach, Delgado, Hidalgo and Velasco (2005) proposes a modified test statistic to be used with estimated residuals. Shao (2011a) has recently extended this setup to cover the weak white noise null hypothesis.

An appealing feature of Cramér-von Mises type tests is detection Pitman local directional alternatives converging to the null with the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$, where n is the sample size. This contrasts with detection results for Box-Pierce type tests as in Hong (1996) or Paparodotis (2000) who both consider slower rates of convergence for local alternatives defined through the spectral density function. Such a finding suggests that Cramér-von Mises tests are more powerful than Box-Pierce ones. One of the contributions of the present paper is to deliver an opposite conclusion for a new class of alternatives defined through the autocovariance function. The new class of alternatives formalizes the idea that small autocorrelation coefficients, say of order ρ_n, can be detected provided that there are enough of them regrouped at reasonably small lags. An important finding of the paper is that detection is still possible for very small $\rho_n = o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$. The intuition is as follows. As seen from Hong (1996), Shao (2011b) and Xiao and Wu (2011), the critical region of the Box-Pierce test of order $p_n \to \infty$ is

$$\frac{n \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \left(\widehat{R}_j^2/\widehat{R}_0^2 - 1\right)}{\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}} \geq c_\alpha, \tag{1.1}$$

where c_α is a normal critical value. Consider an alternative close enough to the null of independence, so that $\xi_j = n^{1/2}\left(\widehat{R}_j/\widehat{R}_0 - R_j/R_0\right)$ can be considered as approximately independent standard normal, where $\widehat{R}_j$ and R_j denote respectively sample and population covariance at lag j. See e.g. Brockwell and Davies (2006, Theorem 11.2.2) for a justification for such a rough and intuitive setup. Then taking this approximation as exact gives, since $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} R_j^2/R_0^2 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \left(\widehat{R}_j^2/\widehat{R}_0^2 - 1\right)}{\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}} &= \frac{n \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} R_j^2/R_0^2}{\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}} + \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p_n} R_j \xi_j/R_0}{\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}} + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p_n}\left(\xi_j^2 - 1\right)}{\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}} \\ &= \frac{n \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} R_j^2/R_0^2}{\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}} + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right).\end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

This expansion shows that the Box-Pierce test is consistent provided $\left(n/\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}\right)\sum_{j=1}^{p_n} R_j^2/R_0^2$ is large enough or diverges. Let N_n be the number of correlation coefficients $R_j^2/R_0^2 \geq \rho_n^2$ for $j \in [1, p_n]$, so that $\left(n/\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}\right)\sum_{j=1}^{p_n} R_j^2/R_0^2 \geq nN_n\rho_n^2/\left(2p_n\right)^{1/2}$. Hence the Box-Pierce test is consistent provided

$$n^{1/2}\left(\frac{N_n}{p_n^{1/2}}\right)^{1/2} \rho_n \to \infty, \tag{1.3}$$

a condition which allows for $\rho_n = o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ provided there are enough correlation coefficients larger than ρ_n, that is $N_n/p_n^{1/2} \to \infty$ which holds in particular when the exact order of N_n is p_n. In plain words, summing sample correlations as in the Box-Pierce statistic allows to detect very small population correlations provided they are not too sparse and concentrated at lags smaller than p_n. Such a detection feature is lost by the Cramér-von Mises type tests which weights down high order correlation coefficients or by the Xiao and Wu (2011) maximum test. As detailed in Section 4, such alternatives includes MA processes with a significant long term multiplier but $o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ impulse response coefficients. Such processes therefore correspond to a macroeconomic scenario where short term policies have no significant effects whereas long term ones may have an impact.

An important limitation of the critical region (1.1) is the use of an ad hoc order P_n. Hong (1996), Shao (2011b) and Xiao and Wu (2011) consider a deterministic $p_n \to \infty$. This is inadequate to detect alternatives with low lags correlation: taking $p_n = 30$ is unlikely to give a test with power against popular $AR(1)$ or $MA(1)$ alternatives with a reasonable sample size. Conversely, taking a fixed p_n as in the original Box and Pierce (1970) paper is not suitable to detect higher order alternatives. The need to properly address the tuning of a smoothing parameter which plays a role similar to p_n has spurred the development of data-driven approaches for various nonparametric testing problems. A recent approach, the so-called adaptive approach, focuses on data-driven tests which detects alternatives in a smoothness class converging to the null at the fastest possible rate given that the smoothness class is unknown to the test builder. See in particular Fan (1996), Spokoiny (1996), Horowitz and Spokoiny (2001), Guerre and Lavergne (2005), Guay and Guerre (2006) and Chen and Gao (2007) for various nonparametric models and related null hypotheses of theoretical or practical relevance. Golubev, Nussbaum and Zhou (2010) has proved Le Cam equivalence of Gaussian time series with spectral density functions in a Besov space and the corresponding continuous time Gaussian white noise model considered in Spokoiny (1996). This result, limited to Gaussian Time Series, is of theoretical nature and cannot deliver ready to apply white noise tests, especially for the weakly correlated alternatives in (**??**). In fact, most of the data-driven choices of p_n proposed in the white noise testing literature do not consider the adaptive rate-optimality issue. An exception is Fan and Yao (2005) which outlines, but do not analyze, a data-driven test which is based on the maximum of a set of Box-Pierce statistics. Popular data-driven choice of the order build on Newey and West (1994), see, among others, the simulation section of Hong and Lee (2005). This practice is however difficult to justify theoretically since such a data-driven order is expected at best to be optimal for estimation of a long run variance, which is the purpose of Newey and West (1994). As it is well known, this will not produce an adaptive rate-optimal test since the optimal order for testing differs from the estimation one, see Ingster (1993) and Guerre and Lavergne (2002). Escanciano and Lobato (2009) proposes a data-driven order choice of the order based on an AIC/BIC criterion which is suitable for estimation but not adaptive rate-optimal for white-noise testing. This contrasts with the new test proposed here which is adaptive rate-optimal with respect to a class of alternatives allowing for correlation coefficients of order $o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ as in (1.3) which, as far as we know, has not been previously considered.

A third issue addressed in the paper concerns the behavior of the data-driven test under the weak white noise hypothesis. For directly observed variables, Escanciano and Lobato (2009) considers a more restrictive martingale difference null hypothesis and, as far as we know, the null limit distribution of test statistics using a data-driven order as in Newey and West (1994) has not been studied yet. Shao (2011b) considers the case of directly observed or estimated residuals. He finds that the standardized Box-Pierce statistic has a standard normal limit distribution under the weak white noise hypothesis, but provided $p_n \to \infty$ so that the resulting test would have low power against low order AR or MA alternatives. When p_n is fixed, available choice of critical values involves the block bootstrap as in Romano and Thombs (1996) and Lobato, Horowitz, Nankervis and Savin (2006) or a matrix standardization of the sample covariance which considerably modifies the Box Pierce statistic as in Lobato, Nankervis and Savin (2002), Francq, Roy and Zakoian (2005) or Delgado and Velasco (2010). These critical values involve a block length or a bandwidth for which there is no obvious choice. We design instead a data-driven choice $\widehat{p}$ of the order used in the test which is asymptotically equal to 1 under the weak white noise hypothesis, for directly observed or estimated residuals. It then suffices to use critical values for $p = 1$, that is for the simple statistic $n\widehat{R}_1^2$. The robust critical values of Lobato (2001) can be used when the residuals are directly observed. For estimated residuals, Kuan and Lee (2006) ones can be used.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 details the penalty approach leading to the data-driven order $\widehat{p}$ and the construction of the rejection region of the test. Section 3 studies the test under the general weak white noise null hypothesis and under the new class of alternatives mentioned above. It illustrates the importance of the choice of a suitable penalty both under the null and the alternative. Section 4 states our adaptive rate-optimality results and compares the new test with the Cramér-von Mises test in Deo (2000), the data-driven test of Escanciano and Lobato (2009) and the Xiao and Wu (2011) maximum test. Section 5 is a simulation experiment which proposes a calibration of the penalty term and a comparison of our automatic test with other data-driven ones, including Escanciano and Lobato (2009) and Newey and West (1994) plug in choice of the order. Section 6 concludes the paper. Our main assumptions are gathered and discussed in an Appendix, while proofs are grouped in a supplementary material document.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF THE TEST AND CHOICE OF THE CRITICAL VALUES

Consider a parametric model $m(X_t, X_{t-1}, , \ldots, Z_t; \theta) = u_t$ and observations X_t, Z_t, $t = 1, ..., n$. The scalar error term u_t has zero mean and finite variance and is unobservable when θ is unknown. In simpler situations u_t can be directly observed as for financial returns. We are interested in testing that u_t is uncorrelated. Let $\widehat{\theta}$ be an estimator of θ and estimate the population residual u_t with its sample counterpart $\widehat{u}_t = u_t(\widehat{\theta})$. Suppose $\{u_t\}$ is a stationary process with zero mean and covariance function $R_j = \mathrm{Cov}(u_t, u_{t+j})$. Then the null and alternative hypotheses are

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : R_j = 0 \text{ for all } j \neq 0, \qquad \text{versus} \qquad \mathcal{H}_1 : R_j \neq 0 \text{ for some } j \neq 0.$$

A natural estimator of the covariance is $\widehat{R}_j = \sum_{t=1}^{n-|j|} \widehat{u}_t \widehat{u}_{t+|j|}/n$, $j = 0, \pm 1, \ldots, \pm(n-1)$ which uses the estimated residuals as if they were the true ones. Given the kernel spectral density estimator

$$\hat{f}_n(\lambda; p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} K\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \widehat{R}_j \exp\left(-ij\lambda\right), \quad K(0) = 1, \; K(x) = K(-x), \text{ and } \int K(x)\, dx = 1,$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ and the support of $K(\cdot)$ is $[0,1]$, Hong (1996) has proposed a Lagrange multiplier type test statistic

$$\widehat{S}_p = n\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \hat{f}_n(\lambda; p) - \frac{\widehat{R}_0}{2\pi} \right|^2 d\lambda = n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \widehat{R}_j^2. \tag{2.1}$$

For the uniform kernel $K(t) = \mathbb{I}(t \in [0,1])$, $\widehat{S}_p$ is the Box-Pierce statistic $\widehat{BP}_p = n \sum_{j=1}^{p} \widehat{R}_j^2$. Large values of $\widehat{S}_p$ indicate evidence against the null. The proposed test builds on a data-driven choice of the order p in an set $[1, \overline{p}_n]$, $\overline{p}_n \leq n-1$. Under standard weak dependence of $\{u_t\}$ and for p large enough, the mean and variance of $\left(\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1\right)/R_0^2$ are asymptotically close to, respectively

$$E_\Delta(p) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right) \left(K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) - K^2(j)\right),$$

$$V_\Delta^2(p) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right)^2 \left(K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) - K^2(j)\right)^2,$$

see e.g. Hong (1996) for independent $\{u_t\}$ and Shao (2011b) for the weak white noise case. In these notations, the subscript "Δ" indicates difference $\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1$. For the Box-Pierce statistic, $E_\Delta(p)$ and $V_\Delta^2(p)$ are respectively equal to $(p-1)(1 + O(p/n))$ and $2(p-1)(1 + O(p/n))$. We propose to select $\widehat{p}$ as the smallest maximizer of a penalized statistic,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{p} &= \arg \max_{p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]} \left(\frac{\widehat{S}_p}{\widehat{R}_0^2} - E(p) - \gamma_n V_\Delta(p) \right) \\ &= \arg \max_{p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]} \left(\frac{\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1}{\widehat{R}_0^2} - E_\Delta(p) - \gamma_n V_\Delta(p) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $E(p) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - j/n) K^2 (j/p)$. Such a penalization procedure is similar to Guay and Guerre (2006) or Guerre and Lavergne (2005). It differs from the ones used in the suboptimal AIC or BIC procedures reviewed in Hart (1997) which uses a higher penalty term $\gamma_n E(p)$ in place of $E(p) + \gamma_n V_\Delta(p)$. Escanciano and Lobato (2009) similarly uses a penalty term $\widehat{\gamma}_n E(p)$ for p in a finite set. The rationale for (2.2) is better understood when $\widehat{S}_p$ is the Box-Pierce statistic $\widehat{BP}_p$ with directly observed or estimated residuals. In this case $\left(\widehat{BP}_p - \widehat{BP}_1\right)/\widehat{R}_0^2 - E_\Delta(p)$ is an estimator of $n \sum_{j=2}^{p} R_j^2/R_0^2$ with a standard deviation which can be proxied with $V_\Delta(p)$ when $p \to \infty$, see Shao (2011b). Hence a large penalized statistic $\left(\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1\right)/\widehat{R}_0^2 - E_\Delta(p) - \gamma_n V_\Delta(p)$ suggests that $n \sum_{j=2}^{p} R_j^2/R_0^2$ is large so that this particular order p should be preferred to $p = 1$. The selected $\widehat{p}$ will retain the best order p with respect to this detection criterion. In particular, under the null, the Markov inequality yields that $\left(\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1\right)/\widehat{R}_0^2 - E_\Delta(p) - \gamma_n V_\Delta(p) = -\gamma_n (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)) V_\Delta(p)$, uniformly with respect to $p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]$ provided γ_n diverges fast enough. Since $V_\Delta(p) > V_\Delta(1) = 0$ for all $p > 1$ and $\gamma_n \to \infty$, $1 = \arg\max_{p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]} (-\gamma_n V_\Delta(p))$ so that $\widehat{p} = 1$ should hold with a probability tending to 1 under $\mathcal{H}_0$. It follows that $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}} = \widehat{S}_1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ under the null, for directly observed or estimated residuals. This leads to the following rejection region of the test

$$\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}} \geq z(\alpha), \tag{2.3}$$

where the critical value $z(\alpha) = \widehat{z}_n(\alpha)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{S}_1 \geq z(\alpha)\right) = \alpha \text{ under } \mathcal{H}_0. \tag{2.4}$$

The critical values used here for directly observed residuals are from Lobato (2001) and from Kuan and Lee (2006) for estimated residuals.

A choice for critical values when $\{u_t\}$ is directly observed is as follows. Let a tilde superscript indicate more explicitely this specific case,

$$\widetilde{S}_p = n \sum_{j=1}^{p} K^2 \left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \widetilde{R}_j^2 \text{ where } \widetilde{R}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-|j|} u_t u_{t+|j|}. \tag{2.5}$$

As seen from Francq et al. (2005) or Lobato et al. (2002), the limit distribution of $\widetilde{S}_1 = nK^2(1)\widetilde{R}_1^2$ depends upon the limit distribution $n^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{R}_1 - R_1\right)$, which is under standard conditions a centered normal with variance

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-1} u_t u_{t+1}\right) = \mathrm{Var}\left(u_0^2 u_1^2\right) + 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(u_0 u_1 - R_1\right)\left(u_k u_{k+1} - R_1\right)\right] = \Gamma_1.$$

Hence, under $\mathcal{H}_0$, the limit distribution of $\widetilde{S}_1/K^2(1)$ is the one of a chi square with one degree of freedom times the nuisance parameter Γ_1. The HAC approach developed by Kiefer, Vogelsang and Bunzel (2000), Sun, Phillips and Jin (2008) and pioneered by Lobato (2001) for weak white noise testing delivers a pivotal test statistic with a null limit distribution which does not depend upon Γ_1. Under suitable conditions, Lobato (2001) shows that

$$\frac{n\widetilde{R}_1^2}{\widetilde{\Gamma}_1}, \text{ where } \widetilde{\Gamma}_1 = \frac{1}{(n-1)^2}\sum_{t=1}^{n-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{t}\left(u_j u_{j+1} - \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} u_j u_{j+1}\right)\right)^2,$$

converges in distribution to

$$\frac{W^2(1)}{\int_0^1 \left(W(r) - rW(1)\right)^2 dr} \tag{2.6}$$

where W is a standard Brownian motion, a limit distribution which is free from the nuisance parameter Γ_1. Hence following Lobato (2001) suggests the critical values

$$\widetilde{z}_L(\alpha) = K^2(1)\,\widetilde{\Gamma}_1 z_L(\alpha), \tag{2.7}$$

where $z_L(\alpha)$ are the critical values obtained from the distribution of the random variable (2.6) which are tabulated in Lobato (2001, Table 1). Alternative approaches would use a Newey and West (1994) estimator of Γ_1 as in Francq et al. (2005), Lobato et al. (2002) or fixed bandwidth asymptotic as in Sun et al. (2008). Note however that these alternative procedures involve an additional choice of a tuning parameter and may be more involved than (2.7).

The HAC procedure of Lobato (2001) has been extended by Kuan and Lee (2006) to deal with the case of estimated residuals. Let $\widehat{\theta}_t$ be the estimator $\widehat{\theta}$ computed with the first t observations and consider the recursive estimator of Γ_1

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_1 = \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t} \left(\widehat{u}_j \left(\widehat{\theta}_t \right) \widehat{u}_{j+1} \left(\widehat{\theta}_t \right) - \frac{n}{n-1} \widehat{R}_1 \right) \right)^2 .$$

Kuan and Lee (2006) shows that, under suitable conditions, $n\widehat{R}_1^2/\widehat{\Gamma}_1$ and $n\widetilde{R}_1^2/\widetilde{\Gamma}_1$ have the same limit distribution. Hence this suggests the critical values

$$\widehat{z}_L(\alpha) = K^2(1)\,\widehat{\Gamma}_1 z_L(\alpha), \quad z_L(\alpha) \text{ as in (2.7).} \tag{2.8}$$

We shall also consider a modified version of the test which uses a standardization of the sample covariances as in Deo (2000) or Escanciano and Lobato (2009),

$$\widehat{S}_p^* = n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \left(\frac{\widehat{R}_j}{\widehat{\tau}_j}\right)^2 \text{ where } \widehat{\tau}_j^2 = \frac{1}{n-j} \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \widehat{u}_t^2 \widehat{u}_{t+j}^2 - \left(\frac{n}{n-j}\widehat{R}_j\right)^2 . \tag{2.9}$$

The sample variance $\widehat{\tau}_j^2$ is an estimator of $\tau_j^2 = \operatorname{Var}(u_t u_{t-j})$ which is the asymptotic variance of $n^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{R}_j - R_j\right)$ in the case of uncorrelated $u_t u_{t+j}$ or for Martingale difference.[1] As above, u_t should be used in place of $\widehat{u}_t$ when the residuals are directly observed, leading to statistics $\widetilde{S}_p^*$ and $\widetilde{\tau}_j^2$ with a tilde subscript instead of a hat one. The corresponding data-driven p and critical values are

$$\widehat{p}^* = \arg \max_{p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]} \left(\widehat{S}_p^* - E(p) - \gamma_n V_\Delta(p) \right), \tag{2.10}$$

$$\widetilde{z}_L^*(\alpha) = \frac{\widetilde{z}_L(\alpha)}{\widetilde{\tau}_1^2} \text{ and } \widehat{z}_L^*(\alpha) = \frac{\widehat{z}_L(\alpha)}{\widehat{\tau}_1^2}. \tag{2.11}$$

---

[1] Note however that τ_j^2 differs from $\operatorname{Var}\left(\sqrt{n}\left(\widetilde{R}_j - R_j\right)\right)$ which would be the appropriate standardization. But in fact all these quantities goes to R_0^2 when $j \to \infty$, which is the reason why they can be used here.

3. ASYMPTOTIC LEVEL AND CONSISTENCY

This section deals with the behavior of the test under the null and the alternative hypotheses. For the sake of exposition and brevity the associated assumptions are grouped and discussed in Appendix A. In what follows, $a_n \asymp b_n$ means that the sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ has the same order, i.e. that there is a constant $C > 1$ such that $|a_n|/C \leq |b_n| \leq C|a_n|$ for n large enough.

An important issue in the construction of the test (2.3) is the choice of the penalty sequence. Choosing γ_n large enough gives that $\widehat{p}$ stays close to 1, hence that the test statistic $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}}$ remains close to $\widehat{S}_1$. Hence, in one hand, using a large γ_n ensures that the level of the test is close to its nominal size due to the choice (2.4) of critical values which is driven by the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{S}_1$. On the other hand, a large γ_n may drastically limit the power of the test since the statistic $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}}$ would not differ from $\widehat{S}_1$, limiting so the power of the test. The trade-off between size and power concerns is addressed by the two first results of this section. Consider first the null hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0$. The following theorem gives a lower bound for γ_n which ensures that the test is asymptotically of level α under the null.

Theorem 1. *Let Assumptions K , M, P and R in Appendix A hold. If the penalty sequence* $\{\gamma_n, n \geq 1\}$ *satisfies*

$$\gamma_n \geq (1+\epsilon)(2\ln\ln n)^{1/2} \quad \text{for some } \epsilon > 0, \tag{3.1}$$

then, under $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{p} = 1) = 1$ *and the test (2.3) is asymptotically of level* α.

The main result of Theorem 1 is about the asymptotic behavior of the selected order $\widehat{p}$, which is asymptotically equal to 1. It then follows that $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}} = \widehat{S}_1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ so that the choice of the critical values (2.7) or (2.8), which accounts for estimation of the residuals and white noise dependence, ensures that the test is asymptotically of level α. Note that $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}} = \widehat{S}_1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ allows to use other critical values than (2.7) or (2.8), as standard one degree of freedom Chi squared ones which are valid under a stronger null of independence. A key result is therefore that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{p} = 1) = 1$ holds when the residuals are estimated or not and under various white noise structure. That this holds for estimated or directly observed residuals comes from (3.1) which imposes $\gamma_n \to \infty$. When $\widehat{\theta}$ is $\sqrt{n}$-consistent as assumed here and under the considered assumptions, estimating the residuals gives test statistics satisfying $\widehat{S}_p = \widetilde{S}_p + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ uniformly in p. The fact that the remainder term $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ is negligible compared to γ_n is a key element to show that the asymptotic behavior of $\widehat{p}$ is not affected by residuals estimation under the null. Compared to the existing adaptive results of Horowitz and Spokoiny (2001), Guerre and Lavergne (2005), Guay and Guerre (2006) or Chen and Gao (2007), an important technical contribution is that Theorem 1 holds without assuming that the set of admissible p is a power set as $\{a^j, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $a > 1$.

Another important finding is that the penalty sequence γ_n can diverge with the low order $(\ln \ln n)^{1/2}$ as allowed by (3.1). This contrasts with the larger order $\ln n$ used in the BIC selection procedure and in the corresponding data-driven tests, see e.g. Hart (1997). In view of the potential negative impact of a large γ_n on the power of the test, it is worth asking if the lower bound (3.1) can be improved. The proof suggests that it is not the case. The key argument comes from the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\widehat{p} \neq 1) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\widetilde{S}_p - \widetilde{S}_1\right)/\widetilde{R}_0^2 - E_\Delta(p) - \gamma_n V_\Delta(p) \geq 0 \text{ for some } p \in [2, \overline{p}_n]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\left(\frac{\left(\widetilde{S}_p - \widetilde{S}_1\right)/\widetilde{R}_0^2 - E_\Delta(p)}{V_\Delta(p)}\right) \geq \gamma_n\right). \qquad (3.2)\end{aligned}$$

for the probability of not selecting 1 when the residuals are directly observed. In the case of the Box-Pierce statistic $\widetilde{S}_p - \widetilde{S}_1 = n\sum_{j=2}^{p} \widetilde{R}_j^2$. The proof then uses a martingale approximation for $\widetilde{R}_j$ as in Xiao and Wu (2011), Shao (2011b), a smooth approximation of the maximum by the L_e norm, $e \to \infty$,[2] and repeated applications of the Lindeberg technique, see Pollard (2002, p.179), to approximate the LHS of (3.2) with

---

[2] For positive $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, $\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} x_k^e\right)^{1/e} = \left(1 + O\left(e^{-1}\ln m\right)\right)\max_{k\in[1,m]} x_k$.

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\left(\frac{1}{(2(p-1))^{1/2}}\sum_{j=2}^{p}\left(\zeta_j^2-1\right)\right)\geq\gamma_n\right),$$

where the ζ_j are i.i.d. standard normal. Hence the best order ensuring that $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{p}\neq 1)=o(1)$ is the order of the maximum of the standardized sum $(2k)^{-1/2}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\zeta_j^2-1\right)$, $k=1,\ldots,\overline{p}_n-1$, which is $(2\ln\ln(\overline{p}_n-1))^{1/2}\asymp(2\ln\ln n)^{1/2}$ as shown by Darling and Erdös (1956). The term $(1+\epsilon)$ is used to control for the fact that the variance of $\widetilde{R_j}/\mathrm{Var}(u_t)$ are close but not equal to 1 due to possible dependence of the uncorrelated $\{u_t\}$. Hence the bound (3.1) cannot be improved.

Let us now turn to the detection properties of the test. Consider first the case of directly observed residuals $\{u_t\}$. In our setup, the correlated alternative $\{u_t\}$ may depend on the sample size and the observations should be denoted $u_{t,n}$, $t=1,\ldots,n$ with a covariance function $R_j=R_{j,n}$, where for each n $\{u_{t,n}\}$ is stationary. This includes for instance local $MA(\infty)$ alternatives $\varepsilon_t+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}a_{i,n}\varepsilon_{t-i}$ where $a_{i,n}\to 0$ when n grows. For estimated residuals $\widehat{u}_t=u_t\left(\widehat{\theta}\right)$, we assume that $\sqrt{n}\left(\widehat{\theta}-\theta_n\right)$ is asymptotically centered for some pseudo true value θ_n and we set $u_t(\theta_n)=u_{t,n}$ since this residual plays an identical role than the alternative $\{u_{t,n}\}$ of the directly observed case. However, for the sake of brevity, we write in both cases u_t and R_j instead of $u_{t,n}$ and $R_{j,n}$.

The new class of alternatives is defined similarly to (1.3) in the Introduction section. Consider first a sequence $\rho_n\to 0$ and a lag order P_n. Autocorrelation coefficients smaller than ρ_n are considered as negligible and an important parameter for detection is the number of correlations above ρ_n,

$$N_n=N_n(P_n,\rho_n)=\#\left\{|R_j/R_0|\geq\rho_n,\quad 1\leq j\leq P_n\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

The next theorem gives a detection condition on N_n, P_n and ρ_n which is similar to (1.3). Note however that (1.3) was derived assuming a known P_n, a condition which is now relaxed.

Theorem 2. *Suppose Assumptions K , M, R and P in Appendix A hold. Then, there exists a constant* $\kappa_* > 0$ *such that the test (2.3) is consistent against all alternatives* $\{u_t\}$ *satisfying, for some* $\rho_n > 0$ *and* $P_n \in [1, \overline{p}_n/2]$,

$$n^{1/2} \left(\frac{N_n}{\gamma_n P_n^{1/2}} \right)^{1/2} \rho_n \geq \kappa_*. \tag{3.4}$$

The most noticeable difference between the detection conditions (3.4) and (1.3) is that the lag index p_n in (1.3) is used in associated critical region (1.1) whereas the lag index P_n in (3.4) is unknown and can take any value in $[1, \overline{p}_n/2]$. This illustrates the adaptive feature of the new test. A second difference is that (3.4) involves the penalty sequence. In fact (3.4) deteriorates with the penalty sequence since increasing γ_n request to increase ρ_n or N_n to ensure that the condition still holds. This illustrates the potential negative impact on the power of the test of the penalty sequence.

For alternatives such that P_n and N_n are prescribed in advance, the detection condition (3.4) allows for a rate ρ_n^* satisfying

$$\rho_n^* \asymp \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\gamma_n P_n^{1/2}}{N_n} \right)^{1/2}. \tag{3.5}$$

Two different regimes emerge in view of (3.5). Of special interest is $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n P_n^{1/2}/N_n = 0$ since (3.5) shows that the test can detect correlation coefficients converging to 0 at a rate that is faster than the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$. The best possible rate in this case is $\rho_n^* \asymp \gamma_n^{1/2} / \left(n P_n^{1/2}\right)^{1/2}$ which is achieved for "saturated" alternatives with $N_n \asymp P_n$. A less favorable case corresponds to more sparse correlation coefficient satisfying $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n P_n^{1/2}/N_n = \infty$. In this case (3.5) does not anymore allow for correlation coefficients converging to 0 with rate $n^{-1/2}$. This case is covered Donoho and Jin (2004) and Ingster (1997) for a theoretical model obtained when observing a known number P_n of independent Gaussian variables with mean $n \left(R_j/R_0\right)^2$ and variance 1. In such a setup, the authors show that the best possible detection rate ρ_n is $(\ln n/n)^{1/2}$, a rate which is achieved by the maximum white noise test of Xiao and Wu (2011). This suggests that our test may not be optimal when $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n P_n^{1/2}/N_n = \infty$. However, it will be shown in Proposition 1 below that the Xiao and Wu (2011) test does not detect moderately sparse alternatives satisfying (3.5) with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n P_n^{1/2}/N_n = 0$ and $\gamma_n \asymp (2\ln\ln n)^{1/2}$.

We conclude this section by showing that the test statistic $\widehat{S}^*_{\widehat{p}^*}$ from (2.9) and (2.10) has a similar behavior than $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}}$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose Assumptions K, M and P in Appendix A hold. Then using* $\left(\widetilde{S}^*_{\widehat{p}^*}, \widetilde{z}^*_L(\alpha)\right)$ *or* $\left(\widehat{S}^*_{\widehat{p}^*}, \widehat{z}^*_L(\alpha)\right)$ *in (2.3) instead of* $\left(\widetilde{S}_{\widehat{p}}, \widetilde{z}_L(\alpha)\right)$ *or* $\left(\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}}, \widehat{z}_L(\alpha)\right)$ *gives a test which satisfies the conclusions of Theorems 1 and 2.*

4. ADAPTIVE RATE-OPTIMALITY AND COMPARISONS WITH OTHER TESTS

While Theorem 1 gives a sharp lower bound (3.1) of order $(2\ln\ln n)^{1/2}$ for the penalty sequence γ_n ensuring that the test is asymptotically of level α, Theorem 2 suggests that increasing γ_n can damage its detection properties. Hence a good compromise for the choice of the penalty sequence suitable both under $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ is $\gamma_n \asymp (2\ln\ln n)^{1/2}$. Once such a choice is made one may wonder if the detection properties of the resulting test can be improved or not. Focusing on alternatives with a prescribed P_n and N_n, this amounts to show that there is no test detecting alternatives with $\sup_{j\in[1,P_n]} |R_j/R_0| = o(\rho_n^*)$ where ρ_n^* is as in (3.5), a property that we call adaptive rate-optimality. More generally this amounts to check that there is no test that can detect alternatives satisfying a condition less restrictive than (3.4), i.e. allowing for a $\kappa_* = \kappa_n \to 0$ in (3.4) leads to consider alternatives that cannot be detected by any possible tests. The next Theorem establishes such adaptive rate-optimality for alternatives satisfying $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n P_n^{1/2}/N_n = 0$.[3]

---

[3] As discussed after (3.5), the test (2.3) is not optimal for detection of sparse alternatives with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma_n P_n^{1/2}/N_n = \infty$ which are not considered here.

Theorem 4. *Consider the case where* $\{u_t\}$ *is directly observed. For any* $\kappa_n \to 0$, *there exists a sequence of alternatives* $\{u_t\}$ *such that, for some* $P_n \in [1, \overline{p}_n]$ *and a* $\rho_n > 0$ *with*

$$\rho_n \geq \frac{\kappa_n}{n^{1/2}} \left(\frac{(2 \ln \ln n)^{1/2} P_n^{1/2}}{N_n} \right)^{1/2}, \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{(2 \ln \ln n)^{1/2} P_n^{1/2}}{N_n} = 0,$$

and satisfying the other assumptions of Theorem 2, that cannot be detected by any possible asymptotically α*-level test,* $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Hence, when $\gamma_n \asymp (2 \ln \ln n)^{1/2}$, it is not possible to improve the detection condition (3.4) and the rate ρ_n^* in (3.5) is optimal. We shall now give alternatives which are detected by the test (2.3) but not by other popular tests. Consider the following high-order moving average process,

$$u_t = u_{t,n} = \varepsilon_t + \frac{\nu \gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}} \sum_{k=1}^{P_n} \psi_k \varepsilon_{t-k}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{P_n} \psi_k^2 = O(P_n), \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} P_n = \infty, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a strong white noise with variance σ^2, ν is a scaling constant and $\gamma_n \asymp (2 \ln \ln n)^{1/2}$. This alternative has MA coefficients of order $\gamma_n^{1/2} / \left(n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4} \right)$ which goes to 0 faster than $n^{-1/2}$ provided P_n diverges with a polynomial rate. Hence short term shocks have a statistically negligible impact. However the long term multiplier of (4.1) is, when $\psi_k = 1$ for all k, equal to $\nu \left(\gamma_n P_n^{3/2} / n \right)^{1/2}$ which has a larger order than $n^{-1/2}$. The following lemma describes the covariance function of the alternative (4.1).

Lemma 1. *If* $P_n = o((n/\gamma_n)^{2/3})$ *and* $\lim_{n \to \infty} (\gamma_n / n) = 0$, *then the alternative* $\{u_t\}$ *in (4.1) satisfies* $R_0 = \sigma^2 \left(1 + O\left(\gamma_n P_n^{1/2} / n \right) \right)$ *and, uniformly in* $j \in [1, P_n]$,

$$R_j = \frac{\nu \gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}} \psi_j \sigma^2 + o\left(\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}} \right).$$

Hence a distinctive feature of the alternative (4.1) when $\max_{1 \leq k \leq P_n} |\psi_k| = O(1)$ is that both its moving average and correlation coefficients approach zero uniformly faster than $n^{-1/2}$ provided P_n / γ_n^2 tends to infinity. We shall show below that the new test (2.3) detects these alternatives but that this not the case of the three following test statistics based on directly observed variables and with $\widetilde{\tau}_j^2$ as in (2.9),

$$W_n = b_n \left(n^{1/2} \max_{j\in[1,J_n]} \left| \frac{\widetilde{R}_j}{\widetilde{\tau}_j} \right| - b_n \right), \quad b_n = \left(2\ln J_n - \ln\ln J_n - \ln(4\pi)\right)^{1/2}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$CvM_n = \frac{n}{\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \frac{\widetilde{R}_j^2}{j^2 \widetilde{\tau}_j^2}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$EL_n = \widetilde{BP}^*_{\widetilde{p}^*_{EL}}, \quad \widetilde{p}^*_{EL} = \arg\max_{p\in[1,J_n]} \left\{ \widetilde{BP}^*_p - \widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL} p \right\} \text{ where} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL} = \begin{cases} \ln n & \text{if } n^{1/2} \max_{j\in[1,J_n]} \left| \frac{\widetilde{R}_j}{\widetilde{\tau}_j} \right| \leq (2.4 \ln n)^{1/2}, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The statistic (4.2) is studied in Xiao and Wu (2011) who shows that W_n has asymptotically an extreme value distribution. The statistic (4.3) is due to Deo (2000) and is a version of the Cramér-von Mises test of Durlauf (1991) partially corrected for heteroskedasticity. The test statistic EL_n has been introduced in Escanciano and Lobato (2009) who considers a fixed J_n. We show that it can also work when J_n increases with the sample size. The numerical value 2.4 used for $\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL}$ is used in the simulation experiment of Escanciano and Lobato (2009) but the proof of Proposition 1 below suggests that any real number strictly larger than 2 would also work. As for our test, the Escanciano and Lobato (2009) selected order $\widetilde{p}^*_{EL}$ is asymptotically equal to 1 under $\mathcal{H}_0$ and similar critical values can be used. To show that these tests do not detect alternatives with small correlation coefficients, it is sufficient to consider the single Gaussian null hypothesis G_0: $\{u_t\}$ is a Gaussian white noise $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ with variance σ^2 and the Gaussian alternative G_1: $\{u_t\}$ is given by (4.1) with Gaussian i.i.d. $\{\varepsilon_t\}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{P_n} \psi_k^2 = O(P_n)$, $\max_{1\leq k\leq P_n} |\psi_k| = O(1)$, $\min_{1\leq k\leq P_n} |\psi_k \sigma^2| \geq 1$, $\nu > 0$, $\gamma_n, P_n \to \infty$ with $\gamma_n / P_n^{1/2} = o(1/\ln n)$ and $P_n = O\left((n/\gamma_n)^{1/14}\right) \leq \overline{p}_n/2$, $\gamma_n \asymp (2\ln\ln n)^{1/2}$ satisfies (3.1). We also assume $J_n = O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$.

Proposition 1. *Let $\{u_t\}$ be directly observed. Suppose that Assumptions K and P in Appendix A holds. Then, for ν large enough, the alternative G_1 satisfies (3.4) and*

(i) The new test (2.3) and its $\widetilde{S}^*_{\widetilde{p}^*}$ version consistently detect G_1;

(ii) By contrast, the statistics W_n, CvM_n and EL_n have the same asymptotic distribution under G_0 and G_1 and the corresponding tests are therefore not consistent.

Proposition 1-(ii) implies that tests based on W_n, CvM_n or EL_n are not adaptive rate-optimal. This is due to a continuous behavior of these test statistics that prevents detection of G_1 as explained now. Let $\widetilde{R}_{0,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}$ and $\widetilde{R}_{1,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}$ be the standardized sample covariance computed under G_0 and G_1 respectively. It is established in the proof of Proposition 1 that

$$\max_{j\in[1,J_n]}\left|\frac{\widetilde{R}_{0,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}}-\frac{\widetilde{R}_{1,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}}\right|=o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{(n\log n)^{1/2}}\right), \tag{4.5}$$

a fact which implies that he tests W_n and CvM_n are not consistent. The case of the EL_n test is a bit more tricky. It is first shown that (4.5) yields $\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL}=\ln n$ with a probability tending to 1 under both G_0 and G_1 because the statistic W_n has the same asymptotic behavior under G_0 and G_1. The next step is to show that $P\left(\widetilde{p}^*_{EL}=1\right)\to 1$ under G_0 and G_1. This holds by construction under G_0. To understand that this also holds under G_1, observe that $\widetilde{p}^*_{EL}=p>1$ implies in particular that $\widetilde{BP}^*_p+\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL}p\geq\widetilde{BP}^*_1+\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL}$ by (4.4), an inequality which is equivalent to

$$\frac{\widetilde{BP}^*_p-\widetilde{BP}^*_1}{p-1}\geq\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL}=\ln n+o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{4.6}$$

But, due to the division by $p-1$, the asymptotic behavior of $\left(\widetilde{BP}^*_p-\widetilde{BP}^*_1\right)/(p-1)$ is the same under G_0 and G_1 by (4.5), so that $P\left(\widetilde{p}^*_{EL}=1\right)\to 1$ under G_1. Since (4.5) also gives that the limit distribution of $\widetilde{BP}^*_1$ is the same under G_0 and G_1, this would also be the case of the test statistic $\widetilde{BP}^*_{\widetilde{p}^*_{EL}}=\widetilde{BP}^*_1+o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, so that the Escanciano and Lobato (2009) test EL_n is inconsistent against G_1. As seen from (4.6), this is due to a too high penalization term $\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL}p$, proportional to p, for $\widetilde{BP}^*_p$. This contrasts with our test which applies a penalty of lower order $\gamma_n p^{1/2}$ to the "debiased" test statistics $\widetilde{BP}^*_p-E(p)$.

5. Simulation experiments

This simulation experiment aims to propose a reasonable value of the penalty sequence γ_n to be tested with various strong and weak white noise processes and with various alternatives. As preliminary experiments have shown that the test statistic $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}}$ may yield an oversized test for some practically relevant white noise processes, we consider the test based on $\widehat{S}^*_{\widehat{p}^*}$ as in (2.9) and (2.10) with the critical values (2.8), $\widetilde{z}^*(\alpha)$ for directly observed variables and $\widehat{z}^*(\alpha)$ for estimated residuals, $\alpha = 10\%$, 5% and 1%. To investigate the impact of choosing a large $\overline{p}_n$ we allows for all possible orders and set $\overline{p}_n = n - 1$. We consider two kernel choices. The first is $K(t) = \mathbb{I}(|t| \leq 1)$ which gives the Box Pierce statistic so that the corresponding tests are labelled BP. The second is a modified Parzen kernel

$$k(t) = \begin{cases} 1 - 6t^2 + 6|x|^3, & |t| \leq 1/2, \\ 2(1-|t|)^3, & 1/2 < |t| \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $k(1) = 0$, we use the choice $K(t) = k(t/2)/k(1/2)$ and label the corresponding tests as Par.

The first experiment parallels Theorem 1 and aims to calibrate the penalty sequence. It analyzes the sensitivity of the test to the penalty term. It investigates the behavior of the test under the null for $\gamma_n = \gamma\left(2\ln\ln(n-2)\right)^{1/2}$ where the proportionality coefficient γ ranges from 2.8 to 3.8. The considered white noise is a directly observed $\{u_t\}$ with a standard normal distribution. The next table reports the simulated levels from $50,000$ replications and the percentage $\%\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$, an important indicator to decide whether a difference between nominal and observed levels is due to $\widehat{p}^*$ or to the choice of critical values.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

In Table 1, a '*' indicates a statistically oversized test, i.e. with a level statistically greater than the nominal one at the 1% level. A threshold value for the BP test is $\gamma = 3.4$ which ensures that the observed sizes are close to the nominal for $n = 1,000$. The Par test is slightly better behaved with this respect. Both tests have very similar $\% \left\{ \widehat{p}^* \neq 1 \right\}$ which is well below 1% for $\gamma = 3.4$. The rest of the simulation experiments will use $\gamma = 3.4$.

Let us now introduce some benchmark tests. We shall compare our BP and Par tests with the data-driven test EL based on the statistic EL_n in (4.4) with $J_n = n - 1$ and the Lobato (2001) and Kuan and Lee (2006) critical values in (2.8). We also consider the Newey-West data-driven order $\widehat{p}_{IMSE}$ used in Hong and Lee (2005) and the test statistic

$$\widehat{p}_{IMSE} = \left(1 \vee \widetilde{c}^{1/5}(f)\right) n^{1/5}, \quad \text{where} \quad \widetilde{c}(f) = \frac{144 \sum_{j=-(n-1)}^{n-1} k\left(j/\widetilde{p}\right) j^4 \widehat{R}_j^2/\widehat{\tau}_j^2}{0.539285 \sum_{j=-(n-1)}^{n-1} k\left(j/\widetilde{p}\right) \widehat{R}_j^2/\widehat{\tau}_j^2},$$

$$IMSE = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{\widehat{p}_{IMSE}} k^2\left(j/\widehat{p}_{IMSE}\right) \left\{ \widehat{R}_j^2/\widehat{\tau}_j^2 - \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right) \right\}}{\left(2 \sum_{j=1}^{\widehat{p}_{IMSE}} k^4\left(j/\widehat{p}_{IMSE}\right) \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right)^2\right)^{1/2}},$$

where $k(\cdot)$ is the Parzen kernel and $\widehat{\tau}_j^2$ is as (2.9). In the definition of $\widehat{p}_{IMSE}$, $\widetilde{p}$ is a pilot bandwidth set to $\widetilde{p} = (4n/100)^{4/25}$. Observe that $\widetilde{c}(f)$ remains potentially stochastic under the null so that the null limit distribution of $\widetilde{IMSE}$ may differ from the standard normal obtained by Hong (1996), Xiao and Wu (2011) and Shao (2011b) for deterministic p. We follow however common practice and the $IMSE$ test will use standard normal critical values. The last benchmark test, CvM, is the Deo (2000) Cramér-von Mises statistic CvM_n in (4.3) and uses the critical values tabulated in Anderson and Darling (1952).

The first comparison under $\mathcal{H}_0$ is based on i.i.d. $\{u_t\}$ with the following distributions: standard normal ('Nor' in Table 2), a Student with three degrees of freedom ('Stud'), and a centered chi square with one degree of freedom ('Chi'). The Student distribution is used to test the sensitivity of our test to the lack of higher-order moments and the chi square one can reveal sensitivity to skewness.

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

As in Table 1, the Par test is slightly better than the BP test but both behave well here. The highest $\%\left\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\right\}$ for the tests BP and Par are achieved the centered chi square distribution. BP and S are slightly oversized under 'Chi' but still behave better than the CvM test which is their best competitor in this experiment. BP and Par seem to be not sensitive to the lack of higher moments as revealed from the 'Stud' experiment. The EL test is oversized due to a very high $\%\left\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\right\}$ since $\%\left\{\widehat{\gamma}_{EL}^* \neq \ln n\right\}$ is also high. Escanciano and Lobato (2009) reports a similar behavior even when J_n remains finite. The $IMSE$ test is conservative at the 10% level but has a level which seems quite far from the nominal size when $\alpha = 5\%$ or 1%. This is due to the fact that $\widehat{p}_{IMSE}$ remains moderate and quite close to 1 while the normal critical values of the $IMSE$ test build on the fact that $\widehat{p}_{IMSE}$ should theoretically diverge under $\mathcal{H}_0$. The CvM test behaves well except for 'Chi' where it is more oversized than BP and Par for $n = 200$.

The next experiment considers directly observed or estimated weak white noise $\{u_t\}$. Two conditional heteroskedastic differences of martingales are examined. The first process is a GARCH(1,1) with $u_t = s_t\zeta_t$ and $s_t^2 = 0.001 + 0.90 s_{t-1}^2 + 0.05 u_{t-1}^2$ where the i.i.d. ζ_t are standard normal. This process, which puts a high weight on s_{t-1}^2, has been used in many simulation experiments, see Lobato et al. (2002) who justifies this choice with financial markets examples or Escanciano and Lobato (2009) among others. The second martingale difference is the ARCH(1) $u_t = s_t\zeta_t$ and $s_t^2 = 0.001 + 0.9 u_{t-1}^2$ with a dynamic of s_t^2 carried by u_{t-1}^2. Due to an ARCH coefficient larger than 1/3, $\mathbb{E}\left[u_t^4\right] = \infty$ and the tests are, in principle, not expected to behave well in this experiment. The three next processes are uncorrelated but are not difference of martingales, so that the CvM test is not expected to have a correct size and is just reported here as a benchmark. The first, labelled 'Bilinear' in Table 3 below, is a bilinear model $u_t = \zeta_t + 0.9\zeta_{t-1}u_{t-2}$. The second, labelled 'No-MDS', is given by $u_t = \zeta_{t-1}\zeta_{t-2}\left(1 + \zeta_{t-2} + \zeta_t\right)$ and is from Lobato (2001). The third, 'All-Pass', is an All-Pass ARMA(1,1) process (Breidt, Davis, and Trindade, 1999) as in Lobato et al.

(2002), $u_t - 0.5u_{t-1} = \zeta_t - \zeta_{t-1}/0.5$ where the i.i.d. ζ_t have a Student distribution with 9 degrees of freedom. Since the root of the MA part is the inverse of the AR root, the resulting process is uncorrelated but the u_t are dependent due to non Gaussian ζ_t. Finally, the last process 'ARRes' considers estimated residuals from the $AR(1)$ $y_t = 0.8y_{t-1} + \zeta_t$, $\widehat{u}_t = y_t - \widehat{\theta} y_{t-1}$, $\widehat{\theta} = \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} y_t y_{t+1} / \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} y_t^2$. The BP, Par and EL tests are all adjusted to tackle the estimation effect by using the critical values $\widehat{z}^* (\alpha)$ of (2.11). The critical values of the tests $IMSE$ and CvM are not adjusted so they are not expected to perform well for this case.

[INSERT TABLE 3 HERE]

The behavior of the BP and Par tests is very good with observed levels which are not oversized in general. This is due in part to a $\% \{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$ which is always much smaller than 1%. However the BP and Par tests can be undersized as in the case of 'ARCH(1)'. But even in this case $\% \{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$ remains very small suggesting that this is due to Lobato (2001) critical values. A not reported simulation study shows indeed that using instead standard Chi-squared values gives much better observed levels around 10%, 4.5% and 0.7% for the BP and Par tests, $n = 200$ or $1,000$. The behavior of the EL test is much more erratic, with observed levels which can be severely oversized as for 'Bilinear' or undersized see 'ARCH(1)'. This comes from a $\% \{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$ which is much higher than for the BP and Par tests. The $IMSE$ test can also be severely undersized or oversized especially at the nominal 5% level. The CvM test performs well except, as expected, for weak white noises or estimated residuals.

We now consider $\mathcal{H}_1$. A first set of low lags alternatives will be calibrated using the Cramér von-Mises norm $D_{CvM}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_j^2 / (\pi^2 j^2 R_0^2)$ which is the counterpart of CvM_n/n. We shall consider lacunary $AR(P)$, $u_t = \theta u_{t-P} + \varepsilon_t$ and $MA(P)$, $u_t = \varepsilon_t + \theta \varepsilon_{t-P}$ satisfying $D_{CvM}^2 = 3/n$ for i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ ε_t. We shall select the positive AR and MA coefficients $\rho_{P,n}$

and $\theta_{P,n}$ with $D^2_{CvM} = 3/n$. It can be shown that this gives

$$\rho_{P,n} = \frac{3^{1/2}P}{n^{1/2}}\left(1 + o\left(1\right)\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \theta_{P,n} = \frac{3^{1/2}P}{n^{1/2}}\left(1 + o\left(1\right)\right),$$

for fixed P so that the resulting alternatives can also be viewed as local Pitman alternatives going to the null with the parametric rate $n^{-1/2}$. For $P = 1$, $n = 200$ and $1,000$, we consider the $AR(1)$ and $MA(1)$ alternatives obtained for $n = 200$, with the view of seeing the impact of increasing the sample size on the power. We also consider larger values of $P = 4$ and 6 in which case we allow the alternative to vary with the sample size. This gives the six following alternatives: $MA1$, $u_t = \varepsilon_t + 0.1244\varepsilon_{t-1}$ for $n = 200$ and $1,000$; $AR1$, $u_t = 0.1233u_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$ for $n = 200$ and $1,000$; $MA4$, $u_t = \varepsilon_t + 0.8165\varepsilon_{t-4}$ for $n = 200$ and $u_t = \varepsilon_t + 0.2307\varepsilon_{t-4}$ for $n = 1,000$; $AR6$, $u_t = 0.6849u_{t-6} + \varepsilon_t$ for $n = 200$ and $u_t = 0.3242u_{t-6} + \varepsilon_t$ for $n = 1,000$. In Tables 4, 5 and 6, $\overline{\widehat{p}^*}$ and $s_{\widehat{p}^*}$ are the simulation mean and standard deviation of $\widehat{p}^*$. Such statistics are useful to conjecture the impact on the power of $\overline{p}_n$ since large or $\overline{\widehat{p}^*}$ and $s_{\widehat{p}^*}$ suggests that decreasing $\overline{p}_n$ can decrease the power.

[INSERT TABLE 4 HERE]

The low lags $AR1$ and $MA1$ experiments have very similar characteristics. The data-driven tests BP, Par and EL seem to be outperformed by the $IMSE$ and CvM tests. This is actually due to the fact that the former use the robust critical values (2.11). Using chi-square critical values as in Table 5 shows that all the test perform similarly. The fact the the $IMSE$ test seems more powerful at the nominal 1% level is not really meaningful since Table 2 reveals that $IMSE$ is oversized at this level.

[INSERT TABLE 5 HERE]

For the higher order experiments $MA4$ and $AR6$, the BP, Par and EL tests behave very similarly and clearly outperform their competitors with a power close to 100%. An interesting fact is the very high values achieved by $\overline{\widehat{p}^*}$ and $s_{\widehat{p}^*}$ for the BP and Par tests. This is due to the selection procedure (2.10) which, compared to (4.4), penalize less large p. Note that such a behavior of $\widehat{p}^{*}$ prevents from using the selected order to estimate the order of the underlying process.

The second set of alternatives are randomized small correlations processes as in (4.1),

$$u_t = \varepsilon_t + \frac{(2.5 \times \gamma_n)^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P^{1/4}} \sum_{k=1}^{P} \psi_{k,b} \varepsilon_{t-k}, \qquad \psi_{k,b} \overset{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0,1). \tag{5.1}$$

In this setting $b = 1, ..., 10,000$ is the simulation index. New MA coefficients $\{\psi_{k,b}\}$ are drawn for each simulations. Randomizing the moving average coefficients allows us to explore various shapes of the correlation function. The noise $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is independent of the moving average coefficients $\{\psi_{k,b}\}$ and is drawn randomly from the standard normal distribution. Since $\sum_{k=1}^{P} \psi_{k,b}^2 = P(1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))$ when P tends to infinity, the covariance structure of the alternatives (5.1) is described in Lemma 1. We consider two scenarios. In the experiment 'LOW', P is set to 15 for $n = 200$ and to 75 when $n = 1,000$. The experiment 'HIGH' doubles the order P, $P = 30$ for $n = 200$ and $P = 150$ for $n = 1,000$. The next table reports our simulation results.

[INSERT TABLE 6 HERE]

The BP test outperforms its competitors. The EL test achieves a similar performance only in the LOW experiment when $P = 15$ and $n = 200$. The Par test performs similarly to the BP test only for large $P = 75, 150$ and $n = 1,000$, in which case it also outperforms EL, $IMSE$ and CvM. The $IMSE$ test performs poorly and is even dominated by CvM due to a $\widehat{p}_{IMSE}$ which remains very close to 2. As well, the average value of $\widehat{p}_{EL}$ is much lower than the ones achieved for the BP and Par tests. The high values of $\overline{\widehat{p}^{*}}_{BP}$ and $\overline{\widehat{p}^{*}}_{Par}$ may suggest that these tests would be affected by a lower choice of $\overline{p}_n$. However setting $\overline{p}_n = 3\left[(n/2)^{1/2}\right]$ give similar conclusions for the BP test.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The paper proposes an automatic test for the weak white noise null hypothesis when the variables are directly observed or estimated residuals. The test is based on a new data-driven selection procedure of the order used in a Box and Pierce (1970) test statistic. The critical region uses Lobato (2001) robust critical values when the variables are directly observed and Kuan and Lee (2006) ones for estimated residuals. An important theoretical finding is that the new test can consistently detect alternatives with small autocorrelation coefficients of order $\rho_n = o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ where n is the sample size, provided that the number of $O\left(\rho_n\right)$ autocorrelation coefficients at reasonably moderate lags remains large enough. The proposed test is shown to be adaptive rate-optimal against this class of alternatives. The paper gives examples of MA alternatives with small autocorrelation coefficients of order $o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ which are detected by the new test but not by previous procedures proposed by Deo (2000), Escanciano and Lobato (2009) or Xiao and Wu (2011). These alternatives correspond to a plausible macroeconomic scenario where a temporary shock has no significant impact whereas permanent ones may cause some significant changes. A simulation experiment has shown that the new test can cope with various weak white noises including some ARCH or GARCH processes popular in empirical finance. The simulation experiment has also confirmed the good power properties of the test regarding detection of standard $AR(1)$ and $MA(1)$ alternatives as well as detection of small $o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ autocorrelation coefficients. The methodology considered here can be applied to many econometric problems which involves models with many parametric coefficients including inference for impulse response functions, VAR Causality testing, significance testing in series expansion or detection of potentially weak instruments.

Appendix A: Main assumptions

In what follows, $\|Z\|_a = \mathbb{E}^{1/a}[|Z|^a]$ where Z is a real r.v. and a a positive real number. When studying the performance of the test under the alternative, we consider a sequence $\{u_{t,n}\}$ of stationary alternatives with autocovariance coefficients $\{R_{j,n}\}$. This means that for each given n, the process $\{u_{t,n}, t \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is stationary. Note that $\{u_{t,n}\}$ and $\{R_{j,n}\}$ were abbreviated into $\{u_t\}$ and $\{R_j\}$ in the main body of the paper. We follow, under the null and the alternative, Xia and Wu (2011), Shao (2011b) and shall restrict ourselves to uncorrelated stationary processes satisfying a Moment Contraction condition from Wu (2005). We shall assume that $u_{t,n} = F_n(\ldots, e_{t-1}, e_t)$ for some measurable $F(\cdot)$ and where the e_t, $t = -\infty, \ldots, +\infty$, are i.i.d. (univariate or not) r.v. Consider an independent copy $\{e'_t\}$ of $\{e_t\}$ and define for $\tau \leq t \leq n$

$$u^{\tau}_{t,n} = F_n(\ldots, e_{\tau-1}, e'_{\tau}, e_{\tau+1}, \ldots, e_{t-1}, e_t),$$

that is e_τ is changed into e'_τ in $u^{\tau}_{t,n}$. The magnitude of the differences $u_t - u^{\tau}_t$ is a measure of the process sensitivity to shocks on the past innovations. More formally assume that for some $a > 0$ and for all $j \geq 0$

$$\left\| u_{t,n} - u^{t-j}_{t,n} \right\|_a \leq \delta_a(j), \text{ where } \delta_a(j) \text{ decreases to 0 when } j \to \infty.$$

Shao (2011b) assumes that $\delta_a(j)$ decreases with an exponential rate, a condition which is fulfilled by many linear or nonlinear time series models, including threshold, stochastic volatility, bilinear or GARCH models, see Shao (2011b), Wu (2005, 2007, 2009) and the references therein. Our main assumptions are given below.

Assumption K. *The kernel function* $K(\cdot)$ *from* $\mathbb{R}^+$ *to* $[0, \infty)$ *is nonincreasing, bounded away from* 0 *on* $[0, 1/2]$ *and continuous differentiable over its support* $[0, 1]$.

Assumption P. *The maximal order* $\overline{p}_n$ *diverges faster than some power with* $\overline{p}_n = o(n^{1/(2(1+3/a))})$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *where* $a > 1$ *is as Assumption R below. The penalty sequence* γ_n *satisfies* $\gamma_n > 0$, $\gamma_n \to \infty$ *and* $\gamma_n = o\left(n^{1/4}\right)$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

Assumption R. *Under* $\mathcal{H}_0$ *and* $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\sup_t \|u_{t,n}\|_{12a} < C_0 R_{0,n}^{1/2}$ *for some* $a > 1$ *and, for some* $b > 0$, $\delta_{12a}(j) \leq C_1 j^{-7-b}$. *Moreover* $1/C_2 \leq R_{0,n} \leq C_2$, *and* $\max_{j \in [1,\overline{p}_n]} R_{0,n}^2 / \operatorname{Var}(u_{t,n} u_{t+j,n}) \leq C_3$.

Assumption M. *The processes* $\{u_{t,n}\}$, *the model and the estimators* $\left\{\widehat{\theta}_t\right\}$ *are such that: (i) There is a sequence* $\{\theta_n\}$, *with* $\theta_n = \theta_0$ *for all* n *under* $\mathcal{H}_0$, *such that*

$$\left\{\left(n^{1/2}\left(\widehat{\theta}_{[ns]} - \theta_n\right)', n^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{[ns]} \left(u_{t,n} u_{t-1,n} - \mathbb{E}\left[u_{t,n} u_{t-1,n}\right]\right)\right)', s \in [0,1]\right\} \tag{A.1}$$

$D_{[0,1]}$*-converges in distribution to a Brownian Motion with a full rank matrix; (ii) The residual function admit a second order expansion* $u_t(\theta) = u_{t,n} + (\theta - \theta_n)' u_{t,n}^{(1)} + (\theta - \theta_n)' u_{t,n}^{(2)} (\theta - \theta_n) + \mathfrak{r}_{t,n}(\theta)$ *where, for any* $C > 0$,

$$\sup_{t \in [1,n]} \sup_{\theta; \|\theta - \theta_n\| \leq C n^{-1/2}} \left|\mathfrak{r}_{t,n}(\theta)\right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \tag{A.2}$$

and, for each n, $\{u_{t,n}, u_{t,n}^{(1)}, u_{t,n}^{(2)}\}$ *is a stationary process with* $\mathbb{E}^{1/2}\left[\|a_t\|^2\right] \leq C_4$, $\{a_t\}$ *being successively* $\left\{u_{t,n}^{(1)}\right\}$, $\left\{u_{t,n}^{(2)}\right\}$ $\{u_{t,n}^2\}$, $\left\{u_{t,n} u_{t,n}^{(1)}\right\}$, $\left\{u_{t,n}^{(1)} u_{t,n}^{(1)\prime}\right\}$, $\left\{u_{t,n} u_{t,n}^{(2)}\right\}$, $\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|u_{t-j,n}^{(1)} u_{t,n}\right\|^2\right] \leq C_5$ *and* $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|n^{-1/2} \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} \left(u_{t-j,n}^{(1)} u_{t,n} - \mathbb{E}[u_{t-j,n}^{(1)} u_{t,n}]\right)\right\|^2\right] \leq C_6$, $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|u_{t,n}^{(1)} u_{t,n} u_{t-j,n}^2\right\|\right] \leq C_7$ *and* $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|n^{-1/2} \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} \left(u_{t,n}^{(1)} u_{t,n} u_{t-j,n}^2 - \mathbb{E}[u_{t,n}^{(1)} u_{t,n} u_{t-j,n}^2]\right)\right\|^2\right] \leq C_8$.

The compact sets $[0,1/2]$ and $[0,1]$ in Assumption K are somehow arbitrary and can be replaced by any nested compact intervals. Note however that Assumption K forbids the use of the Daniell Kernel $K(x) = \sin(x)/x$ due to the nonincreasingness and bounded support conditions.

Assumption R-(i) assumes a polynomial decay for the coefficients $\delta_{12a}(j)$, a condition which is weaker than the exponential rate assumed in Shao (2011b). Note also that, in Assumption

P, the order of $\overline{p}_n$ can come closer to $n^{1/2}$ when a increases. Under Assumption R-(i), $\{u_{t,n}\}$ must have finite moments of order twelve at least. This is mostly needed for a proof of Theorem 1 based on Lindeberg Substitution Method, see Pollard (2002, p.179), which requires to bound moments like $\mathbb{E}\left[\left(u_t^2 u_{t+j}^2\right)^3\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[u_t^{12}\right]$. However our simulation experiments suggest that the test (2.3) is well behaved with a low $\%\left\{\widehat{p} \neq 1\right\}$ even when $\{u_t\}$ has a fat tail Student distribution or no fourth moments as in the ARCH(1) experiment. It is possible that a proof for Theorem 1 which would better use the self normalization of $\widetilde{S}_p/\widetilde{R}_0^2$ can work under better moment conditions as moderate deviation, which is at the core of our proof, does not request existence of higher moments under self normalization (see e.g. de la Peña, Lai and Shao, 2009).

Assumption M is a shortened version of Assumptions B1 and A2 of Kuan and Lee (2006) who uses a standard linear expansion $n^{1/2}\left(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_n\right) = n^{-1/2}\sum_{t=1}^n \psi_t + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ to show that (A.1) satisfies a Functional Central Limit Theorem (FCLT) as requested in M-(i). This FCLT is mostly used under $\mathcal{H}_0$ to show that (2.4) holds. Note that the full rank FCLT condition in Assumption M-(i) can be quite restrictive. For a correctly specified $AR(1)$ model $X_t - \theta X_{t-1} = u_t$, this rules out for instance $\theta = 0$. However such an issue can be addressed when an additional test statistic T with proper critical values $t(\alpha)$ is available, as the ones proposed by Francq et al. (2005), or by Delgado and Velasco (2010, Theorem 3) which gives a general approach to obtain test statistics which are not affected by parameter estimation. Indeed, because $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{p} = 1) \to 1$ under $\mathcal{H}_0$ as shown in Theorem 1, setting $z(\alpha) = \widehat{S}_1 + T - t(\alpha)$ gives $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}} \geq z(\alpha)\right) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{S}_1 \geq z(\alpha)\right) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(T \geq t(\alpha)) = \alpha$. When $\{u_t\}$ is directly observed, Assumption M amounts to Assumption 1 in Lobato (2001) and the FCLT for $n^{-1/2}\sum_{t=1}^{[ns]}(u_t u_{t-1} - \mathbb{E}[u_t u_{t-1}])$ is a consequence of R-(i) and Wu (2007). Assumption M is easily checked for simple linear models and OLS estimation where $u_{t,n}^{(2)}$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{t,n}$ can be set to 0, see also Francq et al. (2005), Hong (1996) and Shao (2011b).

References

ANDERSON T. W. (1993). Goodness of Fit Tests for Spectral Distributions. *The Annals of Statistics* **21**, 830–847.

ANDERSON T. W. and D.A. DARLING (1952). Asymptotic Theory of Certain "Goodness of Fit" Criteria Based on Stochastic Processes. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **23**, 193–212.

BOX, G. and D. PIERCE (1970). Distribution of Residual Autocorrelations in Autoregressive-Integrated Moving Average Time Series Models. *Journal of American Statistical Association* **65**, 1509–1526.

BREIDT, F.J., R.A. DAVIS and A. TRINIDADE (1999). Least Absolute Deviation Estimation for All-Pass Time Series Models. Preprint, Colorado State University.

BROCKWELL, P.J. and R.A. DAVIS (2006). *Time Series: Theory and Methods.* Second Edition, Springer.

CAMPBELL, J.Y., A.W. LO and A.C. CRAIG MACKINLAY (1997). *The Econometrics of Financial Markets.* Second Edition, Princeton University Press.

CHEN, S.X. and J. GAO (2007). An adaptive Empirical Likelihood Test for Parametric Time Series Regression Models. *Journal of Econometrics* **141**, 950–972.

DARLING, D. and P. ERDÖS (1956). A Limit Theorem for the Maximum of Normalized Sums of Independent Random Variables. *Duke Mathematical Journal* **23**, 143–155.

DELGADO, M.A. and C. VELASCO (2010). Distribution-Free Tests for Time Series Models Specification. *Journal of Econometrics* **155**, 128–137.

DELGADO, M.A., J. HIDALGO and C. VELASCO (2005). Distribution Free Goodness-of-Fit Tests for Linear Processes. *The Annals of Statistics* **33**, 2568-2609.

DEO, R.S. (2000). Spectral Tests of the Martingale Hypothesis under Conditional Heteroscedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* **99**, 291-315.

Donoho, D. and J. Jin (2004). Higher criticism for detecting sparse heterogeneous mixtures. *The Annals of Statistics* **32** 962–994

Durlauf, S.N. (1991). Spectral Based Testing of the Martingale Hypothesis. *Journal of Econometrics* **50**, 355-376.

Escanciano, J.C. and I.N. Lobato (2009). An Automatic Portmanteau Test for Serial Correlation. *Journal of Econometrics* **151**, 140–149.

Fan. J. (1996). Test of Significance Based on Wavelet Thresholding and Neyman's Truncation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **91**, 674–688.

Fan, J. and Q. Yao (2005). *Nonlinear Time Series. Nonparametric and Parametric Methods.* Springer.

Francq, C. , R. Roy and J.M. Zakoian (2005). Diagnostic Checking in ARMA Models With Uncorrelated Errors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **100**, 532–544.

Golubev, G.K., M. Nussbaum and H.H. Zhou (2010). Asymptotic Equivalence of Spectrum Density Estimation and Gaussian White Noise. *The Annals of Statistics* **38**, 181–214.

Grenander, U. and M. Rosenblatt (1952). On Spectral Analysis of Stationary Time-series. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences U.S.A.* **38** 519-521.

Guay, A. and E. Guerre (2006). A Data-Driven Nonparametric Specification Test for Dynamic Regression Models. *Econometric Theory* **22**, 543–586.

Guerre, E. and P. Lavergne (2002). Optimal Minimax Rates for Nonparametric Specification Testing in Regression Models. *Econometric Theory* **18**, 1139–1171.

Guerre, E. and P. Lavergne (2005). Rate-Optimal Data-Driven Specification Testing for Regression Models. *The Annals of Statistics* **33**, 840–870.

Hart, J.D. (1997). *Nonparametric Smoothing and Lack of Fit Tests.* Springer-Verlarg, New-York.

Hong, Y. (1996). Consistent Testing for Serial Correlation of Unknown Form. *Econometrica* **64**, 837–864.

Hong, Y. and Y.J Lee. (2005). Generalized Spectral Tests for Conditional Mean Models in Time Series with Conditional Heteroscedasticity of Unknown Form. *Review of Economic Studies* **72**, 499–541.

Horowitz, J.L. and V.G. Spokoiny (2001). An Adaptive, Rate-Optimal Test of a Parametric Mean-Regression Model Against a Nonparametric Alternative. *Econometrica* **69**, 599–631.

Ingster, Y.I. (1993). Asymptotically Minimax Hypothesis Testing for Nonparametric Alternatives. I, II, III. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **2**, 85–114, 171–189 and 249–268.

Ingster, Y.I. (1997). Some Problems of Hypothesis Testing Leading to Infinitely Divisible Distribution. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **6**, 647–669

Kiefer, N.M., T.J. Vogelsang, and H. Bunzel (2000). Simple Robust Testing of Regression Hypotheses. *Econometrica* **68**, 695–714.

Kuan, C.M. and W.M. Lee (2006). Robust M Tests Without Consistent Estimation of the Asymptotic Covariance Matrix. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **101**, 1264–1275.

Lee, J., and Y. Hong (2001). Testing for Serial Correlation of Unknown Form Using Wavelet Methods. *Econometric Theory* **17**, 386–423.

Lobato, I.N. (2001). Testing That a Dependent Process Is Uncorrelated. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96**, 1066–1076.

Lobato, I.N., J.L. Horowitz, J.C. Nankervis and N.E. Savin (2006). Bootstrapping the Box-Pierce Q Test: A Robust Test of Uncorrelatedness. *Journal of Econometrics* **133**, 841–862.

Lobato, I.N., J.C. Nankervis and N.E. Savin (2002). Testing for Zero Autocorrelation in the Presence of Statistical Dependence. *Econometric Theory* **18**, 730–743.

Newey, W.K. and K. West (1994). Automatic Lag Selection in Covariance Matrix Estimation. *Review of Economic Studies*, **61**, pp. 631–653.

de la Peña, V.H., T.L. Lai and Q.M. Shao (2009). *Self-Normalized Processes: Limit Theory and Statistical Applications.* Springer.

Paparoditis, E. (2000). Spectral Density Based Goodness-of-Fit Tests for Time Series Models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **27**, 143–176.

Pollard, D. (2002). *A User's Guide to Measure Theoretic Probability* . Cambridge University Press.

Romano, J.P. and L.A. Thombs (1996). Inference For Autocorrelations Under Weak Assumptions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **91**, 590–600.

Shao, X. (2011a). A bootstrap-assisted spectral test of white noise under unknown dependence. *Journal of Econometrics* **162**, 213–224

Shao, X. (2011b). Testing for White Noise under Unknown Dependence and its Applications to Goodness-of-Fit for Time Series Models. *Econometric Theory* **27**, 312–343.

Spokoiny, V. G (1996). Adaptive Hypothesis Testing Using Wavelets. *The Annals of Statistics* **24**, 2477–2498.

Sun, Y., P.C.B. Phillips and S. Jin (2008). Optimal Bandwidth Selection in Heteroskedasticity-Autocorrelation Robust Tests. *Econometrica* **76**, 175–194.

Xiao, H. and W.B. Wu (2011). Asymptotic Inference of Autocovariances of Stationary Processes. University of Chicago, arXiv:11053423v1.

Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **102**, 14150–14154.

Wu, W.B. (2007). Strong Invariance Principles for Dependent Random Variables. *The Annals of Probability* **35**, 2294–2320.

γ	2.8		3.0		3.2		3.4		3.6		3.8	
n	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1.000
$\alpha_{BP} = 10\%$	11.00*	10.60*	10.70*	10.50*	10.50*	10.30	10.30	10.30	10.20	10.20	10.10	10.20
$\alpha_{BP} = 5\%$	5.92*	5.56*	5.65*	5.40*	5.42*	5.27*	5.27*	5.19	5.13	5.14	5.05	5.10
$\alpha_{BP} = 1\%$	1.86*	1.35*	1.60*	1.21*	1.40*	1.10	1.27*	1.04	1.14*	0.99	1.07	0.96
$\%\left\{\widehat{p}^*_{BP} \neq 1\right\}$	1.25	0.64	0.92	0.43	0.64	0.29	0.46	0.21	0.30	0.14	0.20	0.10
$\alpha_{Par} = 10\%$	10.30	10.20	10.20	10.20	10.10	10.10	10.00	10.10	10.00	10.20	9.99	10.10
$\alpha_{Par} = 5\%$	5.36*	5.23	5.20	5.16	5.08	5.10	5.01	5.07	4.98	5.10	4.94	5.04
$\alpha_{Par} = 1\%$	1.60*	1.21*	1.40*	1.12*	1.24*	1.04	1.13*	0.99	1.06	0.96	1.02	0.96
$\%\left\{\widehat{p}^*_{Par} \neq 1\right\}$	1.24	0.64	0.92	0.43	0.64	0.29	0.46	0.21	0.30	0.10	0.20	0.10

Table 1: Penalty sequence impact on levels $\left(\gamma_n = \gamma\left(2\ln\ln\left(n-2\right)\right)^{1/2}\right.$, 50,000 replications$\left.\right)$**.** A "*" indicates an oversized test at the 1% level.

	Tests	BP		Par		EL		IMSE		CvM	
$\{u_t\}$	n	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000
Nor	$\alpha = 10\%$	10.30	9.95	9.96	9.79	12.00*	10.70*	8.38	7.80	10.10	9.76
	$\alpha = 5\%$	5.42	5.18	5.09	5.03	6.83*	5.84*	6.12*	5.37	5.04	4.74
	$\alpha = 1\%$	1.35*	1.08	1.12	1.02	2.11*	1.42*	3.19*	2.94*	0.81	0.96
	$\%\left\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\right\}$	0.53	0.18	0.21	0.14	2.79	1.19				
Stud	$\alpha = 10\%$	9.52	9.71	9.32	9.66	10.80*	10.20	7.91	7.95	9.58	9.69
	$\alpha = 5\%$	4.63	4.57	4.45	4.53	5.79*	5.08	5.39	5.35	4.41	4.61
	$\alpha = 1\%$	1.00	0.78	0.91	0.79	1.54*	1.01	2.51*	2.53*	0.58	0.73
	$\%\left\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\right\}$	0.30	0.08	0.13	0.09	2.06	0.71				
Chi	$\alpha = 10\%$	10.80*	10.40	10.10	9.97	13.60*	11.90*	9.68	9.04	12.20*	10.90*
	$\alpha = 5\%$	5.62*	5.55	5.08	5.14	8.16*	6.90*	7.27*	6.51*	6.41*	5.82*
	$\alpha = 1\%$	1.88*	1.53*	1.63*	1.29*	3.21*	2.28*	4.41*	3.56*	1.85*	1.64*
	$\%\left\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\right\}$	1.11	0.69	0.83	0.49	4.77	2.66				

Table 2: i.i.d distributions $\left(\gamma_n = 3.4\left(2\ln\ln\left(n-2\right)\right)^{1/2}\right.$, 10,000 replications$\left.\right)$**.** A "*" indicates an oversized test at the 1% level.

	Tests	BP		Par		EL		IMSE		CvM	
$\{u_t\}$	n	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000
GARCH(1,1)	$\alpha = 10\%$	9.91	9.70	9.68	9.57	11.60*	10.50	8.48	8.33	10.20	9.93
	$\alpha = 5\%$	5.13	5.35	4.95	5.24	6.53*	6.01*	6.00*	5.71*	5.06	4.81
	$\alpha = 1\%$	1.32*	1.16	1.26*	1.17	1.99*	1.46*	3.26*	2.98*	1.17	1.03
	$\%\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$	0.51	0.13	0.44	0.12	2.79	1.20				
ARCH(1)	$\alpha = 10\%$	5.92	6.92	5.86	6.92	7.08	7.33	7.61	7.57	9.44	9.63
	$\alpha = 5\%$	2.39	2.83	2.36	2.84	3.33	3.18	4.97	4.89	4.23	4.34
	$\alpha = 1\%$	0.37	0.34	0.44	0.36	1.16	0.50	2.12*	2.37*	0.67	0.70
	$\%\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$	0.21	0.04	0.2	0.05	1.82	0.53				
Bilinear	$\alpha = 10\%$	8.22	9.18	8.21	9.13	15.00*	19.20*	11.00*	10.80*	12.90*	13.60*
	$\alpha = 5\%$	3.65	4.51	3.73	4.50	9.22*	12.90*	8.12*	7.81*	7.15*	7.18*
	$\alpha = 1\%$	0.70	0.91	0.91	1.03	4.00*	5.69*	4.54*	4.37*	1.68*	1.56*
	$\%\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$	0.47	0.27	0.53	0.35	10.80	16.40				
NoMDS	$\alpha = 10\%$	8.33	9.59	8.31	9.60	9.47	10.10	11.80*	12.4*	14.20*	14.70*
	$\alpha = 5\%$	3.44	4.24	3.47	4.28	4.34	4.71	7.95*	8.74*	6.77*	7.60*
	$\alpha = 1\%$	0.49	0.76	0.63	0.89	0.94	1.05	3.96	4.78	1.17	1.61
	$\%\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$	0.13	0.07	0.26	0.26	1.95	0.85				
All Pass	$\alpha = 10\%$	9.36	10.20	9.15	10.10	11.00*	10.80*	5.43	4.90	6.77	6.21
	$\alpha = 5\%$	4.43	5.22	4.19	5.09	5.94*	5.80*	3.38	3.11	2.90	2.65
	$\alpha = 1\%$	1.14	1.17	0.96	1.05	2.04*	1.46*	1.67*	1.49*	0.49	0.38
	$\%\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$	0.39	0.18	0.22	0.03	2.58	0.97				
ARRes	$\alpha = 10\%$	10.20	10.20	10.10	10.20	10.80*	10.50	2.91	3.09	3.87	4.14
	$\alpha = 5\%$	4.89	5.35	4.76	5.33	5.44	5.61*	1.80	1.81	1.60	1.51
	$\alpha = 1\%$	1.21	1.06	1.08	1.06	1.55*	1.25*	0.65	0.68	0.19	0.19
	$\%\{\widehat{p}^* \neq 1\}$	0.20	0.05	0.12	0.04	1.05	0.43				

Table 3: Weak white noise and estimated residuals ($\gamma_n = 3.4\,(2\ln\ln(n-2))^{1/2}$, 10,000 replications). A "*" indicates an oversized test at the 1% level.

$\{u_t\}$	Tests / n	BP 200	BP 1,000	Par 200	Par 1,000	EL 200	EL 1,000	IMSE 200	IMSE 1,000	CvM 200	CvM 1,000
MA1	$\alpha = 10\%$	42.0	92.0	42.6	94.1	43.1	92.1	49.4	98.3	51.9	98.6
	$\alpha = 5\%$	27.8	82.3	29.5	89.7	28.9	82.8	42.6	97.2	39.2	97.2
	$\alpha = 1\%$	9.55	55.3	13.5	80.7	10.6	56.9	32.1	95.8	18.4	90.3
	$\overline{\widehat{p}^*}\ (s_{\widehat{p}^*})$	1.7 (9)	2.2 (29)	2.3 (13)	5.7 (33)	1.2 (2)	1.6 (3)	2.7 (1)	4.0 (0.5)		
AR1	$\alpha = 10\%$	41.2	91.8	41.9	94.2	42.3	91.9	49.0	98.3	52.0	98.6
	$\alpha = 5\%$	28.1	82.3	29.8	90.1	29.2	82.9	42.6	97.7	39.4	97.3
	$\alpha = 1\%$	9.4	55.3	14.0	81.6	10.3	57.3	32	96.2	18.8	90.9
	$\overline{\widehat{p}^*}\ (s_{\widehat{p}^*})$	1.5 (8)	2.35 (30)	2.1 (12)	5.9 (34)	1.2 (2)	1.7 (3)	2.7 (1)	4.03 (0.6)		
MA4	$\alpha = 10\%$	99.7	99.7	97.8	96.1	99.8	99.8	16.5	11.00	71.5	77.6
	$\alpha = 5\%$	98.7	99.2	97.8	96.0	98.8	99.4	12.9	8.0	43.1	44.8
	$\alpha = 1\%$	90.3	93.8	97.7	96.0	90.3	94.3	8.4	4.5	13.0	9.05
	$\overline{\widehat{p}^*}\ (s_{\widehat{p}^*})$	45.9 (68)	23 (118)	80.7 (72)	51 (121)	15.9 (24)	5.8 (5)	2.0 (0.8)	1.9 (0.8)		
AR6	$\alpha = 10\%$	100	100	100	100	100	100	30.1	11.4	79.0	77.4
	$\alpha = 5\%$	100	100	100	100	100	100	25.9	8.56	58.7	42.3
	$\alpha = 1\%$	99.7	99.6	100	100	99.4	99.6	19.6	4.88	28.1	8.53
	$\overline{\widehat{p}^*}\ (s_{\widehat{p}^*})$	163 (48)	242 (376)	192 (26)	271 (357)	97.4 (58)	16.1 (18)	2.3 (0.9)	1.9 (0.8)		

Table 4: Cramer von Mises alternatives ($\gamma_n = 3.4\,(2\ln\ln(n-2))^{1/2}$, 10,000 replications)

$\{u_t\}$	Tests / n	BP 200	BP 1,000	Par 200	Par 1,000	EL 200	EL 1,000
MA1	$\alpha = 10\%$	53.5	98.8	53.2	98.8	54.6	98.5
	$\alpha = 5\%$	40.9	97.5	40.6	97.5	42.4	97.9
	$\alpha = 1\%$	21.1	91.1	20.9	91.1	22.6	96.2
AR1	$\alpha = 10\%$	53.6	98.7	53.5	98.7	54.7	98.7
	$\alpha = 5\%$	41.6	97.2	41.4	97.2	42.8	97.3
	$\alpha = 1\%$	21.9	90.8	21.8	90.2	23.1	90.9

Table 5: Cramer von Mises alternatives (Non robust Chi squared critical values, $\gamma_n = 3.4\,(2\ln\ln(n-2))^{1/2}$, 10,000 replications)

	Tests	BP		Par		EL		IMSE		CvM	
$\{u_t\}$	n	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000	200	1,000
LOW	$\alpha = 10\%$	74.0	94.5	66.5	90.7	73.8	69.0	42.4	33.3	61.2	48.9
	$\alpha = 5\%$	70.1	93.7	63.0	89.7	68.9	65.0	37.8	28.5	48.4	35.8
	$\alpha = 1\%$	62.4	92.9	59.2	88.9	58.4	59.3	30.8	21.7	28.1	17.8
	$\overline{\widehat{p}^*}\ (s_{\widehat{p}^*})$	40.4 (61)	358 (368)	68.6 (79)	577 (367)	14.5 (24)	38.2 (40)	2.5 (1)	2.3 (1)		
HIGH	$\alpha = 10\%$	71.7	95.3	65.1	92.9	62.5	60.4	35.6	28.7	51.8	40.6
	$\alpha = 5\%$	68.3	94.9	61.9	92.3	60.3	56.1	31.1	24.4	38.9	29.0
	$\alpha = 1\%$	63.1	94.5	58.8	91.8	51.5	49.6	24.6	17.7	20.4	13.0
	$\overline{\widehat{p}^*}\ (s_{\widehat{p}^*})$	58.0 (68)	562 (341)	94.9 (91)	850 (299)	19.4 (29)	53.7 (68)	2.4 (1)	2 (1)		

Table 6: Small correlations alternatives $\left(\gamma_n = 3.4\,(2\ln\ln(n-2))^{1/2}\right.$, 10,000 replications$\left.\right)$

Robust Adaptive Rate-Optimal Testing for the White Noise Hypothesis: Supplementary Material

Alain Guay[1]

Emmanuel Guerre[2]

Štěpána Lazarová[3]

This version: 4th October 2011

---

[1] CIRPÉE and CIREQ, Université du Québec à Montréal, e-mail: `guay.alain@uqam.ca`

[2] School of Economics and Finance, Queen Mary, University of London, e-mail: `e.guerre@qmul.ac.uk`

[3] School of Economics and Finance, Queen Mary, University of London, e-mail: `s.lazarova@qmul.ac.uk`

Appendix B: proofs of main results

This section contains the proofs of the results of Section 3. C and C' are constants that may vary from line to line but only depend on the constants of the assumptions. Notation $[\cdot]$ is used for the integer part of a real number and $a \vee b = \max(a,b)$, $a \wedge b = \min(a,b)$. Let $\overline{u}_t^{t-j} = \overline{u}_{t,n}^{t-j}$ be a copy of $u_t = F_n(\ldots, e_{t-1}, e_t)$ obtained by changing e_{t-j}, e_{t-j-1}, $\ldots$ into e'_{t-j}, e'_{t-j-1}, $\ldots$. Then the condition $\left\|u_t - u_t^{t-j}\right\|_a \leq \delta_a(j)$ ensures that

$$\left\|u_t - \overline{u}_t^{t-j}\right\|_a \leq \Theta_a(j) \text{ where } \Theta_a(j) = \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \delta_a(j). \tag{B.1}$$

We first state some intermediary results that are used in the proofs of our main results. These intermediary results are proven in Appendix C. Lemma B.1 gives the order of standardization terms $E(p)$, $E_\Delta(p)$ and $V_\Delta(p)$. Propositions B.1 and B.2 deal with the impact of the estimation of θ. Proposition B.3 is used to study the asymptotic null behavior of the test and to show that $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{p} = 1) \to 1$ in Theorem 1. Proposition B.3 deals with directly observed or estimated residuals thanks to Propositions B.1 and B.2. Propositions B.4 and B.5 are the key tools for our consistency result, Theorem 2. They dealt with directly observed variables but are combined with Propositions B.1 and B.2 to deal with estimation errors in the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma B.1. *Suppose Assumption K holds and that* $\overline{p}_n/n \leq 1/2$. *(i) There exists a constant* $C > 1$ *such that, for* $q = 1, 2$ *and for any* $1 \leq p \leq \overline{p}_n$, $\frac{p}{C} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right)^q K^{2q}\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \leq Cp$, $\frac{p}{C} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} K^{2q}\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \leq Cp$, $V_\Delta^2(p) \leq Cp$, *and* $E_\Delta(p) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) - K^2(j)\right) \leq Cp^{1/2}V_\Delta(p)$; *(ii) Under Assumption P, for all* n *and all* $p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]$, $V_\Delta(p) \geq C(p-1)^{1/2}$ *and* $E_\Delta(p) \geq 0$.

Lemma B.2. *Suppose Assumptions M and R hold. Then the statistics and associated critical values* $\left(\widetilde{S}_1, \widetilde{z}_L(\alpha)\right)$, $\left(\widetilde{S}_1^*, \widetilde{z}_L^*(\alpha)\right)$, $\left(\widehat{S}_1, \widehat{z}_L(\alpha)\right)$ *and* $\left(\widehat{S}_1^*, \widehat{z}_L^*(\alpha)\right)$ *satisfy (2.4) that is give an asymptotic* α *level test. Moreover, under* $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\widetilde{z}_L(\alpha)$, $\widetilde{z}_L^*(\alpha)$, $\widehat{z}_L(\alpha)$ *and* $\widehat{z}_L^*(\alpha)$ *are all* $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

Lemma B.3. *Under Assumption R,* $\sup_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} \operatorname{Var}\left(\widetilde{R}_j\right) \leq \frac{C}{n}$.

Proposition B.1. *Suppose Assumptions M, P and R hold. Then* $\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$, $\max_{p\in[0,n-1]} n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right)^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, *and*

$$\max_{j\in[0,n-1]}\left|\widetilde{R}_j-\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)R_{j,n}\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right),$$

$$\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\widehat{R}_j-R_{j,n}\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right),$$

$$\max_{j\in[0,n-1]}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)\left|\widetilde{\tau}_j^2-\tau_{j,n}^2\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right),$$

$$\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\widehat{\tau}_j^2-\tau_{j,n}^2\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right).$$

Proposition B.2. *Let Assumptions K, M, P and R hold. Let* $\widetilde{S}_p$ *be as in (2.5). Then*

$$\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\frac{\left|\left(\widehat{S}_p-\widehat{S}_1\right)-\left(\widetilde{S}_p-\widetilde{S}_1\right)\right|}{1+\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p}R_{j,n}^2\right)^{1/2}} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

and for any $p_n = O(n^{1/2})$, $\widehat{S}_{p_n}-\widetilde{S}_{p_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1+\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p_n}R_{j,n}^2\right)^{1/2}\right)$.

Proposition B.3. *Suppose Assumptions K, M, P and R hold and that* $\mathcal{H}_0$ *is true. Then (3.1) ensures that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\frac{(\widehat{S}_p-\widehat{S}_1)/\widehat{R}_0^2-E_\Delta(p)}{V_\Delta(p)}\geq\gamma_n\right)=0.$$

Proposition B.4. *Under Assumptions K, P and R, there are some* $C, C'>0$ *such that for* n *large enough and uniformly in* $p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{S}_p\right]-R_{0,n}^2E(p)\geq Cn\sum_{j=1}^{p/2}R_{j,n}^2-C'R_{0,n}^2,$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}K\left(\frac{j}{p}\right)\frac{\widetilde{R}_j^2}{\tau_{j,n}^2}\right]-E(p)\geq Cn\sum_{j=1}^{p/2}\left(\frac{R_{j,n}}{R_{0,n}}\right)^2-C'.$$

Proposition B.5. *Under Assumptions K, P and R, there is a constant $C>0$ such that for n large enough and uniformly in $p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]$,*

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\widetilde{S}_p\right)\leq C\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p}R_{j,n}^2+p\right),$$
$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}K\left(\frac{j}{p}\right)\frac{\widetilde{R}_j^2}{\tau_{j,n}^2}\right)\leq C\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{R_{j,n}^2}{R_{0,n}^2}+p\right).$$

B.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.** (3.2), (3.1) and Proposition B.3 give that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(\widehat{p}\neq 1)=0$. Hence $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}}=\widehat{S}_1+o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and Lemma B.2, which ensures that the retained critical value satisfies (2.4), yield that the test (2.3) is asymptotically of level α. □

B.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.** The definition (2.2) of $\widehat{p}$ gives, for any $p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}}&=\arg\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\left\{\widehat{S}_p-\widehat{R}_0^2E(p)-\gamma_n\widehat{R}_0^2V_\Delta(p)\right\}+\widehat{R}_0^2E(\widehat{p})+\gamma_n\widehat{R}_0^2V_\Delta(\widehat{p})\\&\geq\widehat{S}_p-\widehat{R}_0^2E(p)-\gamma_n\widehat{R}_0^2V_\Delta(p).\end{aligned}$$

Since the critical value $z(\alpha)$ in (2.3) is bounded under $\mathcal{H}_1$ by Lemma B.2, it is sufficient to find a $p_n\in[1,\overline{p}_n]$ such that $\widehat{S}_{p_n}-\widehat{R}_0^2E(p_n)-\gamma_n\widehat{R}_0^2V_\Delta(p_n)\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}+\infty$. Let $p_n=2P_n$ where P_n is as in (3.4). Set

$$\mathcal{R}_n^2=\sum_{j=1}^{P_n}\left(\frac{R_{j,n}}{R_{0,n}}\right)^2.$$

The detection condition (3.4) gives

$$n\mathcal{R}_n^2\geq n\rho_n^2\sum_{j=1}^{P_n}\mathbb{I}\left\{\left(\frac{R_{j,n}}{R_{0,n}}\right)^2\geq\rho_n^2\right\}=nN_n\rho_n^2\geq\frac{\kappa_*^2\gamma_n p_n^{1/2}}{2^{1/2}}\to\infty,\tag{B.2}$$

with a constant κ_* which can be chosen as large as needed. Lemmas B.1, B.3, Assumption P which ensures $P_n=o\left(n^{1/2}\right)$ and $\gamma_n=o\left(n^{1/4}\right)$, and Proposition B.1 for the case of estimated residuals yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{S}_{p_n} - \widehat{R}_0^2 E\left(p_n\right) - \gamma_n \widehat{R}_0^2 V_\Delta\left(p_n\right) \\
&= \widetilde{S}_{p_n} + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1 + n^{1/2} R_{0,n} \mathcal{R}_n\right) - R_{0,n}^2 E\left(p_n\right) - \gamma_n R_{0,n}^2 V_\Delta\left(p_n\right) + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{p_n + \gamma_n p_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2}}\right) \\
&\geq \widetilde{S}_{p_n} + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1 + n^{1/2} R_{0,n} \mathcal{R}_n\right) - R_{0,n}^2 E\left(p_n\right) - C\gamma_n R_{0,n}^2 p_n^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now the Chebycheff inequality, Propositions B.4 and B.5, give

$$\widetilde{S}_{p_n} = \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{S}_{p_n}\right] + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\operatorname{Var}^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{S}_{p_n}\right)\right) \geq R_{0,n}^2 E\left(p_n\right) + C' R_{0,n}^2 n \mathcal{R}_n^2 + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(p_n^{1/2} + n^{1/2} \mathcal{R}_n\right).$$

Hence substituting gives, since $n\mathcal{R}_n^2 \to \infty$ by (B.2),

$$\widehat{S}_{p_n} - \widehat{R}_0^2 E\left(p_n\right) - \gamma_n \widehat{R}_0^2 V_\Delta\left(p_n\right) \geq C' R_{0,n}^2 n \mathcal{R}_n^2 \left(1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)\right) - C\gamma_n R_{0,n}^2 p_n^{1/2}\left(1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)\right).$$

Since Assumption R ensures that $R_{0,n}^2$ stays bounded away from 0, (B.2) gives that $\widehat{S}_{p_n} - \widehat{R}_0^2 E\left(p_n\right) - \gamma_n \widehat{R}_0^2 V_\Delta\left(p_n\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} +\infty$ as requested provided $\kappa_*^2 > C'/C$. □

B.3. **Proof of Theorem 3.** Consider first the null hypothesis. As seen from the proof of Theorem 1, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{(\widehat{S}_p^* - \widehat{S}_1^*) - E_\Delta(p)}{V_\Delta(p)} \geq \gamma_n\right) = 0,$$

a statement which implies that $\widehat{p}^* = 1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ so that Lemma B.2 implies that the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds for the test based upon $\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}^*}^*$. Since $|R_{j,n}| \leq \|u_{t,n}\|_2 \left\|u_{t,n} - \overline{u}_{t,n}^{t-j}\right\|_2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[u_{t-j,n}^2 u_{t-j,n}^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\overline{u}_{t,n}^{t-j}\right)^2 u_{t-j,n}^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(u_{t,n}^2 - \left(\overline{u}_{t,n}^{t-j}\right)^2\right) u_{t-j,n}^2\right] \\
&= R_{0,n}^2 + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(u_{t,n} - \overline{u}_{t,n}^{t-j}\right)\left(u_{t,n} + \overline{u}_{t,n}^{t-j}\right) u_{t-j,n}^2\right],
\end{aligned}$$

(B.1) shows

$$\left|\tau_{j,n}^2 - R_{0,n}^2\right| \leq C \|u_{t,n}\|_8^3 \,\Theta_2(j) \leq C j^{-6} \tag{B.3}$$

for all $j \geq 1$. Now Lemmas B.1 and B.3, Assumptions K, P and R, and Proposition B.1 give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{\left|(\widehat{S}_p^* - \widehat{S}_1^*) - (\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1)/\widehat{R}_0^2\right|}{V_\Delta(p)} \leq C \max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{\left|\widehat{S}_p^* - \widehat{S}_p/\widehat{R}_0^2\right|}{p^{1/2}} \\
&\leq C \max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{n}{p^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left(\frac{\widehat{R}_j}{\widehat{R}_0}\right)^2 \left\{ \left|\frac{\widehat{\tau}_j^2}{\widehat{R}_0^2} - \frac{\tau_{j,n}^2}{R_{0,n}^2}\right| + \left|\frac{\tau_{j,n}^2}{R_{0,n}^2} - 1\right| \right\} \\
&\leq Cn\overline{p}_n^{1/2} O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{3/2}\right) + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)\, n \sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \frac{\widehat{R}_j^2}{j^6} \\
&= o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \frac{\operatorname{Var}\left(n^{1/2}\widehat{R}_j\right)}{j^6}\right) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (3.1) and Proposition B.3

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{(\widehat{S}_p^* - \widehat{S}_1^*) - E_\Delta(p)}{V_\Delta(p)} \geq \gamma_n\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{(\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1)/\widehat{R}_0^2 - E_\Delta(p)}{V_\Delta(p)} + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \geq \gamma_n\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{(\widehat{S}_p - \widehat{S}_1)/\widehat{R}_0^2 - E_\Delta(p)}{V_\Delta(p)} \geq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)(2\ln\ln n)^{1/2}\right) + o(1) \\
&= o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired result under $\mathcal{H}_0$.

Consider now Theorem 2 and $\mathcal{H}_1$. Define

$$\widehat{S}_p^\bigstar = n \sum_{j=1}^{p} K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \frac{\widehat{R}_j^2}{\tau_{j,n}^2}, \quad \widetilde{S}_p^\bigstar = n \sum_{j=1}^{p} K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \frac{\widetilde{R}_j^2}{\tau_{j,n}^2}.$$

Let P_n be as in (3.4) and define $p_n = 2P_n$ and $\mathcal{R}_n$ as in the proof of Theorem 2. Then Assumptions K and R, Propositions B.1 and B.2

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\widehat{S}_{p_n}^* - \widehat{S}_{p_n}^\bigstar\right| \leq Cn \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \frac{\widehat{R}_j^2}{\tau_{j,n}^2} \left|\frac{\tau_{j,n}^2}{\widehat{\tau}_j^2} - 1\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right) \check{S}_{p_n}^\bigstar, \\
&\left|\widehat{S}_{p_n}^\bigstar - \widetilde{S}_{p_n}^\bigstar\right| \leq C\left|\widehat{S}_{p_n} - \widetilde{S}_{p_n}\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n^{1/2}\mathcal{R}_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for directly observed or estimated residuals,

$$\widehat{S}_{p_n}^{*} = \left(1 + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right)\right)\widetilde{S}_{p_n}^{\bigstar} + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n^{1/2}\mathcal{R}_n\right)$$

The proof now follows the steps of the one of Theorem 2 based on the order above, Proposition B.4 and B.5, and Lemma B.3 which gives $\mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{S}_{p_n}^{\bigstar}\right] \leq C\left(p_n + n\mathcal{R}_n^2\right)$. Hence, since $p_n = o\left((\log n/n)^{1/2}\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{S}_{\widehat{p}^*}^{*} &= \arg\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\left\{\widehat{S}_p^{*} - E\left(p\right) - \gamma_n V_{\Delta}\left(p\right)\right\} + E\left(\widehat{p}^*\right) + \gamma_n V_{\Delta}\left(\widehat{p}^*\right) \\
&\geq \widehat{S}_{p_n}^{*} - E\left(p_n\right) - C\gamma_n p_n^{1/2} \\
&= \left(1 + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right)\right)\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{S}_{p_n}^{\bigstar}\right] + \mathrm{Var}^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{S}_{p_n}^{\bigstar}\right)\right) - E\left(p_n\right) - C\gamma_n p_n^{1/2} \\
&= C' R_{0,n}^2 n\mathcal{R}_n^2 - C\gamma_n R_{0,n}^2 p_n^{1/2} + O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(p_n^{1/2} + n^{1/2}\mathcal{R}_n + \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\left(p_n + n\mathcal{R}_n^2\right)\right) \\
&= C' R_{0,n}^2 n\mathcal{R}_n^2\left(1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)\right) - C\gamma_n R_{0,n}^2 p_n^{1/2}\left(1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} +\infty
\end{aligned}$$

provided κ_* is large enough. □

B.4. **Proof of Theorem 4.** We first introduce a set of alternatives. Let $f\left(\cdot\right)$ denote the spectral density of a centered Gaussian stationary process $\{u_t\}$ .with covariance coefficients R_j. Define a Hölder class of processes as

$$\text{Hölder}\left(L\right) = \left\{\{u_t\}:\ 1/3 \leq \inf_{\lambda\in[-\pi,\pi]} f\left(\lambda\right) \leq \sup_{\lambda\in[-\pi,\pi]} f\left(\lambda\right) \leq 3,\ \sup_{\lambda\in[-\pi,\pi]}\left|f'\left(\lambda\right)\right| \leq L,\ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\left|R_j\right| \leq L\right\}.$$

The next Lemma describes a family of alternatives which satisfies Assumption R uniformly for prescribed constants and a given $\delta_a\left(j\right)$.

Lemma B.4. *Consider a centered stationary Gaussian process $\{u_t\}$ with spectral density function $f\left(\lambda\right) = \exp\left(g\left(\lambda\right)\right)/\left(2\pi\right)$, where*

$$g\left(\lambda\right) = 2\rho\sum_{k=1}^{p} b_k\cos\left(k\lambda\right), \qquad b_k = -1, 0, 1. \tag{B.4}$$

If $p \geq 1$ *and* $\rho \geq 0$ *are such that* $p^2\rho \leq \epsilon \leq 1/6$ *then there is some constant* $L > 0$*, independent of* ϵ*,* p*,* ρ *and* $b = (b_k, k \in [1,p])$*, such that (i)* $|R_0 - 1| \leq 6\rho\epsilon$ *and* $|R_j - \rho b_j| \leq 6\rho\epsilon$ *for* $j \in [1,p]$*; (ii)* $|R_j| \leq 3\rho\,(2\epsilon)^{\ell}$ *for all* j *in* $[\ell p + 1, (\ell+1)\,p)$ *and all* $\ell \geq 1$*; (iii)* $\{u_t\}$ *is in Hölder*(L)*; (iv) Suppose that* $\rho_n^2 = \rho_n^2(p) = 2\kappa_n^2\,(2\log\log n)^{1/2} / \left(np^{1/2}\right)$ *for some* $\kappa_n > 0$ *and bounded away from infinity, and that* $p \in [1, P_n]$ *with* $P_n = o\left(\left(n/\left(\kappa_n^2 \log\log n\right)^{1/2}\right)^{1/14}\right)$*. Then the associated family of processes* $\left\{u_t\,(b,p)\,; b \in \{-1,0,1\}^p, p \in [1,P_n]\right\}$ *satisfies Assumption R for any* $a > 0$ *and a* $\delta_a\,(j) = O\left(j^{-7-1/4}\right)$*.*

Proof of Lemma B.4. Rewrite g as $g\,(\lambda) = \rho \sum_{k=-p}^{p} b_k \exp(ik\lambda)$, $b_0 = 0$, $b_k = b_{-k} = b_{|k|}$. Since $\exp(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} x^m/m!$ uniformly over any compact set and $\max_\lambda |g\,(\lambda)| \leq 2p\rho \leq 2\epsilon \leq 1/3$, we have

$$R_j = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(-ij\lambda)\, f\,(\lambda)\, d\lambda = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(-ij\lambda)\,(g\,(\lambda))^m\, d\lambda. \tag{B.5}$$

For $m > 0$, since $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(-ij\lambda)\, d\lambda = 2\pi$ if $j = 0$ and 0 if $j \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(-ij\lambda)\,(g\,(\lambda))^m\, d\lambda \\ &= \frac{\rho^m}{2\pi} \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_m)\in K_m} b_{k_1} \times \cdots \times b_{k_m} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(i\,(k_1 + \ldots + k_m - j)\,\lambda)\, d\lambda \\ &= \rho^m \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_m)\in K_m(j)} b_{k_1} \times \cdots \times b_{k_m}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

where K_m is the set of m-tuples with entries in $[-p,p] \setminus \{0\}$ so that $\#K_m = (2p)^m$ and $K_m\,(j)$ contains m-tuples in K_m for which $k_1 + \cdots + k_m = j$ so that $\#K_m(j) \leq (2p)^{m-1}$.

Proof of (i). Part (i) is a consequence of (B.5), (B.6) and inequality $2p\rho \leq 2\epsilon < 1$ which together imply that for $j \in [0,p]$, $|R_j - \mathbb{I}\,(j=0) - \rho b_j| \leq \rho \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{(2p\rho)^{m-1}}{m!} \leq 2p\rho^2 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \leq 2e\rho\epsilon < 6\rho\epsilon$.

Proof of (ii). Let $\ell p + 1 \leq j > (\ell+1)\,p$. Observe that $K_m\,(j)$ is an empty set when $m \leq \ell$. Hence it follows from (B.5) and (B.6) that $|R_j| \leq \left|\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(-ij\lambda)\,(g\,(\lambda))^m\, d\lambda\right| \leq \rho \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} \frac{(2p\rho)^{m-1}}{m!} \leq \rho\,(2\epsilon)^{\ell}\, e$.

Proof of (iii). Observe that $|g(\lambda)| \leq 2\rho p \leq 2\epsilon \leq 1/3$ and that therefore

$$1/3 < 1 - 1/3 < \exp(-1/3) \leq f(\lambda) \leq \exp(1/3) \leq e \leq 3 \qquad \text{for all } \lambda \in [-\pi, \pi].$$

Parts (i), (ii) and $0 \leq \rho \leq \epsilon < 1/6$, $p\rho \leq 1/6$ yield that, for L large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |R_j| &\leq R_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{p} |R_j| + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=\ell p+1}^{(\ell+1)p} |R_j| \leq 1 + 6\rho\epsilon + (1+6\epsilon) p\rho + 3 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (\ell+1) p\rho (2\epsilon)^{\ell} \\ &\leq 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (\ell+1)(2\epsilon)^{\ell} \leq L.\end{aligned}$$

Since $f'(\lambda) = g'(\lambda) f(\lambda)$ with $g'(\lambda) = -2\rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} b_k k \sin(k\lambda)$, we have $\sup_{\lambda \in [-\pi,\pi]} |f'(\lambda)| \leq 3 \times 2p^2\rho \leq 1$.

Proof of (iv). Let $u_t = \varepsilon_t + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \psi_j \varepsilon_{t-j}$ be the Wold decomposition of the process. Brillinger (2001) and $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log f(\lambda) \exp(ij\lambda)\, d\lambda / 2\pi = \rho b_j$ gives

$$\psi_j = \frac{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp\left(\rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} b_k \exp(-ik\lambda)\right) \exp(ij\lambda)\, d\lambda}{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp\left(\rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} b_k \exp(-ik\lambda)\right) d\lambda},$$

$$\operatorname{Var}(\varepsilon_t) = \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp\left(\rho \sum_{k=1}^{p} b_k \exp(-ik\lambda)\right) d\lambda \right|^2.$$

Arguing as in (i) and (ii) with an expansion as in (B.5) give $\operatorname{Var}(\varepsilon_t) = 1$, $|\psi_j - \rho b_j| \leq C\rho\epsilon$ for $j \in [1, p]$ and $|\psi_j| \leq C\rho (2\epsilon)^{\ell}$ for all $j \in [\ell p + 1, (\ell+1)p)$ and all $\ell \geq 1$. Gaussianity, the choice of ρ in (iv) with the restriction on P_n and Wu (2005) give, for any $a > 1$, $\delta_{12a}(j) \leq C_a |\psi_j| \leq C_a j^{-7-1/4}$. That the other conditions of Assumption R hold uniformly in $p \in [1, P_n]$ follows from (i) and (ii). $\square$

We will now define a family $\mathcal{F}_n$ of correlated Gaussian alternatives. We first introduce some notation. Consider $\widetilde{\gamma}_n = (2 \ln \ln n)^{1/2}$ and $\mathcal{P}' = \{2^j, j = 1, \ldots, J_n\}$, $2^{J_n} = P_n = o\left(\overline{p}_n \wedge (n/\widetilde{\gamma}_n)^{1/14}\right)$ so that $\mathcal{P}' \subset [1, \overline{p}_n]$ for n large enough. Define also

$$\rho_n^2(p) = 2\frac{\kappa_n^2 \widetilde{\gamma}_n}{n p^{1/2}}, \quad \widetilde{\rho}_n(p) = 2\rho_n^2(p) \quad \epsilon_n = P_n^2 \rho_n(P_n) = \frac{(\widetilde{\gamma}_n)^{1/2} \kappa_n P_n^{7/4}}{n^{1/2}} = o(1). \qquad \text{(B.7)}$$

Since $p^2\rho_n(p) \leq \epsilon_n$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}'$, ϵ_n plays the role of the real number ϵ of Lemma B.4 and we assume from now on that n is so large that $\epsilon_n \leq 1/6$. Consider the following log-spectral density functions:

$$g\left(\lambda; b, p\right) = 2\widetilde{\rho}_n(p) \sum_{k \in [p,2p)} b_k \cos\left(k\lambda\right), \quad b = \left(b_1, \ldots, b_{P_n}\right) \in \left\{-1, 1\right\}^{P_n}, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

Functions g are of the form specified in (B.4). Let W be a symmetric standard Brownian motion process. Consider a centered stationary Gaussian processes

$$u_{t,n}\left(b, p\right) = \frac{1}{\left(2\pi\right)^{1/2}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp\left(\frac{g\left(\lambda; b, p\right)}{2}\right) \exp\left(it\lambda\right) dW\left(\lambda\right).$$

Observe that $\{u_{t,n}\left(0, p\right)\}$ does not depend on p and is a Gaussian white noise process with variance 1. Let $\{R_{j,n}\left(b, p\right)\}$ denote the covariance function of $\{u_{t,n}\left(b, p\right)\}$. The family $\mathcal{F}_n$ of Gaussian processes can now be defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \left\{\{u_{t,n}\left(b, p\right)\}, b \in \left\{-1, 1\right\}^{P_n}, p \in \mathcal{P}'\right\}.$$

Lemma B.4 implies that all sequences $\{u_{t,n}\}$ in $\mathcal{F}_n$ satisfies Assumption R and that $\mathcal{F}_n \subset$Hölder(L). We now study the asymptotic behavior of the stochastic covariance sequence $\{R_{j,n}\left(B, P\right)\}$. Let $N_n\left(b, p\right)$ be as in (3.3), that is

$$N_n\left(b, p\right) = N_n\left(\{u_{t,n}\left(b, p\right)\}, p, \rho_n\left(p\right)\right) = \#\left\{\left|\frac{R_{j,n}\left(b, p\right)}{R_{0,n}\left(b, p\right)}\right| \geq \rho_n\left(p\right), \ j \in [1, p]\right\}.$$

Lemma B.4-(i,ii) and (B.7) gives that $N_n\left(b, p\right) = p/2$ for n large enough and uniformly in $p = 2^j \in \mathcal{P}'$, so that $\rho_n^2(p) = 2\kappa_n^2\widetilde{\gamma}_n/\left(np^{1/2}\right) = \kappa_n^2\widetilde{\gamma}_n p^{1/2}/\left(nN_n\left(b, p\right)\right)$. Hence the sequences $\{u_{t,n}\}$ in $\mathcal{F}_n$ satisfies condition (i) in Theorem 4. Therefore the Theorem will be proved if we show that $\sup_{T_n} \min_{\{u_{t,n}\} \in \mathcal{F}_n} \mathbb{P}\left(T_n = 0\right) \leq \alpha + o\left(1\right)$, where $\sup_{T_n}$ is a supremum over asymptotically α-level tests. Since the equivalence result of Golubev et al. (2010) holds over $\mathcal{F}_n \subset$Hölder(L) this is equivalent to show that $\sup_{T_n} \min_{\{U_n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n} \mathbb{Q}\left(T_n = 0\right) \leq \alpha + o\left(1\right)$, $\mathbb{Q}$

being the distribution of the continuous time regression model

$$dU_n(\lambda; b, p) = g(\lambda; b, p)\, d\lambda + 2\pi^{1/2} \frac{dW(\lambda)}{n^{1/2}}, \qquad \lambda \in [-\pi, \pi],$$

where $W(\cdot)$ is a Brownian motion over $\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi]$. This can be done as in Spokoiny (1996, Proof of Theorem 2.3) by bounding $\sup_{T_n} \min_{\{U_n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n} \mathbb{Q}(T_n = 0)$ with a Bayes risk, based on the choice of a uniform distribution for p and a Bernoulli one for b. □

B.5. **Proof of Lemma 1.** The first approximation $R_{0,n} = \sigma^2 \left(1 + O\left(\gamma_n P_n^{1/2}/n\right)\right)$ follows easily from the definition (4.1) of the alternative. To show that the second approximation is valid, note that for $j = 1, \ldots, P_n$,

$$R_{j,n} = \frac{\nu\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}} \psi_j \sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\nu\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}}\right)^2 (\psi_{j+1}\psi_1 + \cdots + \psi_{P_n}\psi_{P_n - j})\, \sigma^2.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $|\psi_{j+1}\psi_1 + \cdots + \psi_{P_n}\psi_{P_n-j}| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{P_n} \psi_k^2 = O(P_n)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, P_n$, hence, uniformly in $j = 1, \ldots, P_n$,

$$R_{j,n} = \frac{\nu\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}} \psi_j \sigma^2 + O\left(\frac{\gamma_n P_n^{1/2}}{n}\right) = \frac{\nu\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}} \psi_j \sigma^2 + o\left(\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}}\right)$$

since $P_n = o((n/\gamma_n)^{2/3})$. □

B.6. **Proof of Proposition 1.** Let us now check consistency of the test (2.3) under the assumption that $\min_{k \in [1, P_n]} |\psi_k \sigma^2| \geq 1$. Define $\rho_n = (\nu/2)\, \gamma_n^{1/2} / \left(n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}\right)$. Lemma 1 implies that $N_n = P_n(1 + o(1))$ for such a ρ_n, which therefore satisfies

$$\rho_n = (1 + o(1))\, (\nu/2) \left(\gamma_n P_n^{1/2} / N_n\right)^{1/2} / n^{1/2},$$

so that (3.4) asymptotically holds provided $\nu \geq 3\kappa^*$ and the test is consistent if $1 \leq P_n \leq \overline{p}_n/2$ by Theorem 2 provided the considered alternatives satisfies Assumption R. Wu (2005) gives that the alternative (4.1) satisfies for any $a > 0$,

$$\delta_{12a}(j) \leq C_a \frac{\nu\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{1/2} P_n^{1/4}} |\sigma\psi_j| \text{ for all } j \in [1, P_n],\ \delta_{12a}(j) = 0 \text{ for all } j > P_n.$$

Hence the condition $P_n = O\left((n/\gamma_n)^{1/14}\right)$ gives that $\delta_{12a}(j) \leq Cj^{-7-1/4}$ since the $|\sigma\psi_j|$ are bounded away from infinity. Moreover Gaussianity ensures that

$$\|u_{t,n} - \varepsilon_t\|_{12a} \leq C_a \sigma \left(\frac{\nu^2\gamma_n}{nP_n^{1/2}} \sum_{k=1}^{P_n} \psi_k^2\right)^{1/2} = O\left(\frac{\nu\gamma_n^{1/2}P_n^{1/4}}{n^{1/2}}\right) = o(1),$$

which gives $\operatorname{Var}(u_{t,n}) = \sigma^2 + o(1)$ and $\max_{j\in[1,n]} \operatorname{Var}^2(u_{t,n}) / \operatorname{Var}(u_{t,n}u_{t+j,n}) = 1 + o(1)$ so that Assumption R holds. This ends the proof of Proposition 1-(i).

Consider now the other tests in Proposition 1-(ii). Define $\widetilde{R}_{1,j} = \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} u_{t,n}u_{t+j,n}/n$, $\widetilde{R}_{0,j} = \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \varepsilon_t\varepsilon_{t+j}/n$, $\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}^2 = \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} u_{t,n}^2 u_{t+j,n}^2/(n-j) - n\widetilde{R}_{1,j}^2/(n-j)$ and $\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}^2 = \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \varepsilon_t^2\varepsilon_{t+j}^2/(n-j) - n\widetilde{R}_{0,j}^2/(n-j)$. Define also $\eta_t = \eta_{t,n} = \nu\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \psi_k\varepsilon_{t-k}$, setting $\psi_k = 0$ for $k > P_n$, so that $u_{t,n} = \varepsilon_t + \gamma_n^{1/2}\eta_t/\left(n^{1/2}P_n^{1/4}\right)$. We have

$$\left|\widetilde{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_{0,j}\right| \leq \frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \eta_t\varepsilon_{t+j}\right| + \frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \varepsilon_t\eta_{t+j}\right| + \frac{\gamma_n}{n^2P_n^{1/2}}\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \eta_t\eta_{t+j}\right|.$$

The Burkholder inequality gives, for any $a > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \eta_t\varepsilon_{t+j}\right\|_a \leq C\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}(n-j)^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\|\eta_t\|_a \leq C\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}P_n^{1/4}}{n},\\
&\left\|\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(\varepsilon_t\eta_{t+j} - \psi_j\varepsilon_t^2\right)\right\|_a \leq \left\|\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\varepsilon_t\left(\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\psi_j\varepsilon_{t+j-k}\right)\right\|_a\\
&+\left\|\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(\sum_{k=j+1}^{\infty}\psi_j\varepsilon_{t+j-k}\right)\varepsilon_t\right\|_a \leq C\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}P_n^{1/4}}{n},\\
&\left\|\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(\varepsilon_t^2 - \sigma^2\right)\right\|_a \leq C\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{nP_n^{1/4}}, \quad \left\|\frac{\gamma_n}{n^2P_n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\eta_t^2\right\|_a \leq \frac{\gamma_n}{nP_n^{1/2}} \leq C\frac{\gamma_nP_n^{1/2}}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

for all j. Note also that $\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\eta_t\eta_{t+j}\right| \leq \sum_{t=1}^{n}\eta_t^2$ and the Markov inequality give for a large enough, since $\gamma_n P_n^{1/2} = o(n^{1/4})$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{j\in[1,n]}\left|\widetilde{R}_{1,j}-\widetilde{R}_{0,j}\right|^a = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\max_{j\in[1,n]}\left|\widetilde{R}_{1,j}-\widetilde{R}_{0,j}\right|^a\right)\\
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\|\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}P_n^{1/4}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\eta_t\varepsilon_{t+j}+\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\varepsilon_t\eta_{t+j}\right\|_a^a+\left\|\frac{\gamma_n}{n^2P_n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\eta_t^2\right\|_a^a\right)\\
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n\left(\frac{\gamma_n^{1/2}P_n^{1/4}}{n}\right)^a+\left(\frac{\gamma_n P_n^{1/2}}{n}\right)^a\right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n^{7a/8-1}}+\frac{1}{n^{3a/4}}\right)\\
&= o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{(n\log n)^{a/2}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\max_{j\in[1,n]}\left|\widetilde{R}_{1,j}-\widetilde{R}_{0,j}\right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{(n\log n)^{1/2}}\right). \tag{B.8}$$

Arguing similarly for the $\widetilde{\tau}_{k,j}^2$ give, since $J_n = O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$

$$\max_{j\in[1,J_n]}\left|\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}^2-\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}^2\right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{(n\log n)^{1/2}}\right) \quad , \max_{j\in[1,J_n]}\left|\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}^2-\sigma^4\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{\log^{1/2}n}{n^{1/2}}\right), \tag{B.9}$$

where the latter is from Proposition B.1. Note that (B.8) and (B.9) gives (4.5). Let $W_{k,n}$, $CvM_{k,n}$, $EL_{k,n}$ be the statistic computed under G_k, $k=0,1$, i.e. with $\widetilde{R}_{0,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}$ and $\widetilde{R}_{1,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}$. Note that (B.8) and (B.9) gives $W_{1,n} = W_{0,n} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. (4.5) and Proposition B.1 give

$$\begin{aligned}
&|CvM_{1,n}-CvM_{0,n}| \leq \frac{2}{\pi^2}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\frac{n\left|\left(\widetilde{R}_{1,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}+\widetilde{R}_{0,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}\right)\left(\widetilde{R}_{1,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}-\widetilde{R}_{0,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}\right)\right|}{j^2}\\
&\leq 2\max_{j\in[1,J_n]}\frac{\left|n^{1/2}\widetilde{R}_{0,j}\right|}{\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}}\times\max_{j\in[1,J_n]}\left|n^{1/2}\left(\frac{\widetilde{R}_{1,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}}-\frac{\widetilde{R}_{0,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}}\right)\right|\frac{2}{\pi^2}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\frac{1}{j^2}\\
&+\max_{j\in[1,J_n]}n\left(\frac{\widetilde{R}_{1,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}}-\frac{\widetilde{R}_{0,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}}\right)^2\frac{2}{\pi^2}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\frac{1}{j^2}\\
&= n^{1/2}O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right)n^{1/2}o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{(n\log n)^{1/2}}\right)+n\,o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n\log n}\right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1),
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $CvM_{1,n} = CvM_{0,n} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. For EL_n, $W_{1,n} = W_{0,n} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and Xiao and Wu (2011) gives that $\max_{j\in[1,J_n]} \left|\widetilde{R}_{k,j}/\widetilde{\tau}_{k,j}\right| \leq (2\ln n)^{1/2}(1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))$ for $k = 0, 1$ so that $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{\gamma}^*_{EL} = \ln n) \to 1$ under G_0 and G_1.We now show that $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{p}^*_{EL} = 1) \to 1$ under G_0. Propositions B.4 and B.5, (B.9) give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{p}^*_{0,EL} \neq 1\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,J_n]} \frac{\widetilde{BP}^*_{0,p} - \widetilde{BP}^*_{0,1}}{p-1} > \ln n\right) + o(1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left((1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)) \max_{p\in[2,J_n]} \frac{n\sum_{j=2}^{p} \widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\sigma^4}{p-1} > \ln n\right) + o(1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{n\sum_{j=2}^{p} \widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\sigma^4}{p-1} > \frac{1}{2}\ln n \text{ for some } p \in [2, J_n]\right) + o(1) \\
&\leq \sum_{p=2}^{J_n} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{n\sum_{j=2}^{p}\left(\widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\sigma^4 - \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\sigma^4\right]\right)}{p-1} > \frac{1}{2}\ln n - \frac{n\sum_{j=2}^{p}\mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\sigma^4\right]}{p-1}\right) + o(1) \\
&\leq \sum_{p=2}^{J_n} \frac{\operatorname{Var}\left(\frac{n\sum_{j=2}^{p}\left(\widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\sigma^4 - \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\sigma^4\right]\right)}{p-1}\right)}{\left(\frac{1}{2}\ln n - \frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{j=2}^{p}(1 - j/n)\right)^2} + o(1) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\log^2 n}\sum_{p=2}^{J_n}\frac{1}{p-1} + o(1) = O\left(\frac{1}{\log n}\right) + o(1) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that Proposition B.1 and (4.5) give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{p\in[2,J_n]}\left|\frac{\widetilde{BP}^*_{0,p} - \widetilde{BP}^*_{0,1}}{p-1} - \frac{\widetilde{BP}^*_{1,p} - \widetilde{BP}^*_{1,1}}{p-1}\right| \leq \max_{p\in[2,J_n]}\left|\frac{n\sum_{j=2}^{p}\left(\widetilde{R}^2_{0,j}/\widetilde{\tau}^2_{0,j} - \widetilde{R}^2_{1,j}/\widetilde{\tau}^2_{1,j}\right)}{p-1}\right| \\
&\leq 2\max_{p\in[2,J_n]}\left|n^{1/2}\frac{\widetilde{R}_{0,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}}\right| \times \max_{p\in[2,J_n]}\left|n^{1/2}\left(\frac{\widetilde{R}_{0,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}} - \frac{\widetilde{R}_{1,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}}\right)\right| + \left(\max_{p\in[2,J_n]}\left|n^{1/2}\left(\frac{\widetilde{R}_{0,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{0,j}} - \frac{\widetilde{R}_{1,j}}{\widetilde{\tau}_{1,j}}\right)\right|\right)^2 \\
&= n^{1/2}O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right)n^{1/2}o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{(n\log n)^{1/2}}\right) + no_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n\log n}\right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

This, since arguing as in the bound above gives $\max_{p\in[2,J_n]}\left|\left(\widetilde{BP}^*_{0,p} - \widetilde{BP}^*_{0,1}\right)/(p-1)\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\log^{1/2} n\right)$, implies that $\max_{p\in[2,J_n]}\left|\left(\widetilde{BP}^*_{1,p} - \widetilde{BP}^*_{1,1}\right)/(p-1)\right| \leq \log n$ with a probability tending to 1 and then $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{p}^*_{EL} = 1) \to 1$ under G_1. Hence (4.5) gives that $EL_{1,n} = \widetilde{BP}^*_{1,1} +$

$o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = \widetilde{BP}^{*}_{0,1} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = EL_{0,n} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, so that EL_n converges in distribution to a Chi square one with one degree of freedom under G_0 and G_1. □

APPENDIX C: PROOFS OF INTERMEDIARY RESULTS

The proofs also use the notion of cumulants, see for example Brillinger (2001, p. 19) or Xiao and Wu (2011) for a definition. Let

$$\operatorname{Cum}\left(u_{t_{1,n}}, \dots, u_{t_{q,n}}\right) = \Gamma_n(t_1, \dots, t_q)$$

stands for the qth cumulants of $\{u_{t,n}\}$. The next theorem on cumulant summability is Theorem 21 in Xiao and Wu (2011). These authors do not formally consider sequences $\{u_{t,n}\}$ but the following result is a straightforward extension of Xiao and Wu (2011).

Theorem C.1 (Shao and Wu (2011)). *Suppose $\{u_{t,n}\}$ is stationary for each n, with*

$$\sup_n \|u_{t,n}\|_{q+1} < \infty \text{ and } \sup_n \left\|u_{t,n} - u_{t,n}^{t-j}\right\|_q \leq \delta_q(j) \text{ where } \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j^{q-2}\delta_q(j) < \infty.$$

Then there is a $\mathcal{C}$ which only depends on $\sup_n \|u_{t,n}\|_{q+1}$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j^{q-2}\delta_q(j)$ such that

$$\sum_{t_2,\dots,t_q=-\infty}^{\infty} |\Gamma_n(0, t_2, \dots, t_q)| \leq \mathcal{C}.$$

In what follows, we drop subscript n in expressions like $u_{t,n}$, $R_{j,n}$, $\Gamma_n(\cdot)$ and θ_n when there is no ambiguity. We denote

$$K_{jp} = K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) - K^2(j) \qquad \text{and} \qquad K_{1n}(p) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} K_{jp}. \tag{C.1}$$

C.1. **Proof of Lemma B.1.** (i) The first three bounds of the lemma follow directly from Assumption K which implies that $K^2(j/p) \geq K^2(j)$ for all j and $\mathbb{I}(x \in [0,1/2])/C \leq K^{2q}(x) \leq C\mathbb{I}(x \in [0,1])$ for some $C > 0$. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies that for any $p \in [1, n/2]$, $E_\Delta(p) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right)K_{jp} \leq K_{1n}(p) \leq p^{1/2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j^2(p)\right)^{1/2} \leq Cp^{1/2}V_\Delta(p)$, which is the last bound in (i). (ii) Write $p = 1 + \nu$. Since $p \le \overline{p}_n \le n/2$, the support of $K(\cdot)$ is $[0,1]$ and $K(\cdot)$ is a decreasing function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_\Delta^2(p) &\ge \frac{1}{2} \times 2 \sum_{j=2}^{p} K^2\left(\frac{j}{p}\right) \ge \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} K^2\left(\frac{1+j}{1+\nu}\right) \ge \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \int_j^{j+1} K^2\left(\frac{1+x}{1+\nu}\right) dx \\ &= \int_1^{\nu+1} K^2\left(\frac{1+x}{1+\nu}\right) dx = \nu \int_0^1 K^2\left(\frac{2+z\nu}{1+\nu}\right) dz. \end{aligned}$$

The map $\nu \longmapsto (2+z\nu)/(1+\nu)$, $z \in [0,1)$, is decreasing. Hence, for $\nu \ge 2$, $V_\Delta^2(p) \ge \nu \int_0^{1/2} K^2\left(\frac{2+2z}{3}\right) dz \ge C(p-1)$. Now $V_\Delta^2(2) \ge 2\left(K^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - K^2(1)\right)^2 > 0$ gives the desired result for $V_\Delta(p)$. Since K is nonincreasing, $p \longmapsto E_\Delta(p)$ is non decreasing and $E_\Delta(p) \ge 0$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$. □

C.2. **Proof of Lemma B.2.** Under $\mathcal{H}_0$, The proof repeats the steps of Lobato (2001) and Kuan and Lee (2006) using the joint FCLT of Assumption M. The joint FCLT of Assumption M gives that the critical values are $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ under $\mathcal{H}_1$. □

C.3. **Proof of Lemma B.3.** Equation (5.3.21) in Priestley (1981) and Theorem C.1 gives uniformly in j,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}\left(\widetilde{R}_j\right) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j_1=-n+j+1}^{n-j-1} \left(1 - \frac{|j_1|+j}{n}\right)\left(R_{j_1}^2 + R_{j_1+j}R_{j_1-j} + \Gamma(0,j_1,j,j_1+j)\right) \\ &\le \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j_1=-2n}^{2n} R_{j_1}^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j_2,j_3,j_4=-\infty}^{+\infty} |\Gamma(0,j_2,j_3,j_4)| \\ &\le \frac{4}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} R_j^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j_2,j_3,j_4=-\infty}^{+\infty} |\Gamma(0,j_2,j_3,j_4)| < C. \square \end{aligned}$$

C.4. **Proof of Proposition B.1.** For the sake of brevity we assume that θ is unidimensional. That

$$\max_{j\in[0,n-1]}\left|\widetilde{R}_j-\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)R_{j,n}\right|=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right),$$

$$\max_{j\in[0,n-1]}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)\left|\widetilde{\tau}_j^2-\tau_{j,n}^2\right|=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right),$$

follow from Xiao and Wu (2011, Theorem 2). Note that these authors do not consider stationary sequences $\{u_{t,n}\}$ but their arguments carry over under Assumption R. Hence it suffices to study $\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right|$ and $\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\widehat{\tau}_j^2-\widetilde{\tau}_j^2\right|$ since $\overline{p}_n/n=o\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ under Assumption P. We then now show that $\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right|=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$. Let $e_t=\widehat{u}_t-u_t$, so that

$$\widehat{R}_j=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(u_t+e_t\right)\left(u_{t+j}+e_{t+j}\right)=\widetilde{R}_j+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(u_te_{t+j}+e_tu_{t+j}\right)+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}e_te_{t+j}$$

with, by the Cauchy Schwarz inequality, $\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}e_te_{t+j}\right|/n\leq\sum_{t=1}^{n}e_t^2/n$ and, under Assumption M, for $\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_t=\mathfrak{r}_t\left(\widehat{\theta}\right)$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}u_te_{t+j}=\left(\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right)\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}u_tu_{t+j}^{(1)}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right)^2\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}u_tu_{t+j}^{(2)}+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}u_t\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_{t+j}.$$

Now, observe that Assumption M gives $\widehat{\theta}-\theta=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$, $\max_{t\in[1,n]}\left|\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_t\right|=o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1/n\right)$ and

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}e_t^2\leq3\left(\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right)^2\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left(u_t^{(1)}\right)^2+\frac{3}{4}\left(\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right)^4\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left(u_t^{(1)}\right)^2+\frac{3}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left|\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_t\right|=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right),$$

$$\max_{j\in[1,n]}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(u_t\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_{t+j}+u_{t+j}\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_t\right)\right|\leq\frac{2\max_{t\in[1,n]}\left|\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_t\right|}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left|u_t\right|=o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

This gives, uniformly in $j\in[1,n]$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right|&\leq\left|\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right|\left|\mathbb{E}\left[u_tu_{t+j}^{(1)}+u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}\right]\right|\\&+\left|\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right|\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(u_tu_{t+j}^{(1)}+u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}-\mathbb{E}\left[u_tu_{t+j}^{(1)}+u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}\right]\right)\right|+O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).\qquad\text{(C.2)}\end{aligned}$$

It also follows from Assumption M and $\overline{p}_n = o\left(n^{1/2}\right)$ that $\left|\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right| \max_{j\in[1,n]} \left|\mathbb{E}\left[u_t u_{t+j}^{(1)} + u_{t+j} u_t^{(1)}\right]\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1/n^{1/2}\right)$, $n\left(\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}^2\left[u_t u_{t+j}^{(1)} + u_{t+j} u_t^{(1)}\right] = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and for $A_t(j) = u_t u_{t+j}^{(1)} + u_{t+j} u_t^{(1)} - \mathbb{E}\left[u_t u_{t+j}^{(1)} + u_{t+j} u_t^{(1)}\right]$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right| \max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]} \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} A_t(j)\right| \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right) \sum_{j=0}^{\overline{p}_n} \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} A_t(j)\right| \\
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\overline{p}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/2}\left[\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} A_t(j)\right)^2\right]\right) \\
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\overline{p}_n \max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]} \left[\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} A_t(j)\right)^2\right]\right) = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&n\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\widehat{\theta}-\theta\right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} A_t(j)\right)^2 \\
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)\frac{1}{n} O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} A_t(j)\right)^2\right]\right) \\
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)\frac{1}{n} O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n \max_{j\in[0,n]} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j} A_t(j)\right)^2\right]\right) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives $\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]} \left|\widehat{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_j\right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(n^{-1/2}\right)$ and $\max_{p\in[0,n-1]} n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(\widehat{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_j\right)^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. The study of $\max_{j\in[0,\overline{p}_n]} \left|\widehat{\tau}_j^2 - \widetilde{\tau}_j^2\right|$ is similar. $\square$

C.5. **Proof of Proposition B.2.** For the sake of brevity we assume that θ is unidimensional. Since $\widehat{R}_j^2 - \widetilde{R}_j^2 = \left(\widehat{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_j\right)^2 + 2\widetilde{R}_j\left(\widehat{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_j\right)$, Proposition B.2 is a direct consequence of Proposition B.1 and Lemma C.1 below.

Lemma C.1. *Assume that Assumptions K, M, P and R hold. Then*

$$\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} \frac{\left|n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(K^2(j/p) - K^2(j)\right)\widetilde{R}_j\left(\widehat{R}_j - \widetilde{R}_j\right)\right|}{\left(1 + n\sum_{j=1}^{p} R_j^2\right)^{1/2}} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

and $n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} K^2(j/p_n)\widetilde{R}_j\left(\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right)=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(1+n\sum_{j=1}^{p_n}R_j^2\right)^{1/2}\right)$ *for any* $p_n=O(n^{1/2})$.

Proof of Lemma C.1. We just prove the first equality since the proof of the second is very similar. Define $\overline{R}_j=\mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{R}_j\right]=(1-j/n)R_j$. We have

$$\left|n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}K_{jp}\widetilde{R}_j\left(\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right)\right|\leq C_n(p)+D_n(p),\ \text{where}$$

$$C_n(p)=\left|n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}K_{jp}R_j\left(\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right)\right|,$$

$$D_n(p)=\left|n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}K_{jp}\left(\widetilde{R}_j-\overline{R}_j\right)\left(\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right)\right|.$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Assumption K gives

$$C_n(p)\leq C\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p}R_j^2\right)^{1/2}\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(\widehat{R}_j-\widetilde{R}_j\right)^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

Hence Proposition B.1 yields that $\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}|C_n(p)/\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p}R_j^2\right)^{1/2}|=O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. For $D_n(p)$, Assumptions K, M, (C.2) and $\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_t=\mathfrak{r}_t\left(\widehat{\theta}\right)$ give

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}D_n(p)&\leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}D_{1n}(p)+\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}D_{2n}(p)\right)+O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1})\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}D_{3n}(p)\\&\quad+\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}e_t^2+2\frac{\max_{t\in[1,n]}|\mathfrak{r}_t|}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}|u_t|\right)\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}D_{4n}(p),\end{aligned}$$

where $D_{1n}(p)=n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left|\widetilde{R}_j-\overline{R}_j\right|\left|\mathbb{E}\left[u_tu_{t+j}^{(1)}+u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}\right]\right|$,

$$D_{2n}(p)=n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left|\widetilde{R}_j-\overline{R}_j\right|\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(u_tu_{t+j}^{(1)}+u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}-\mathbb{E}\left[u_tu_{t+j}^{(1)}+u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}\right]\right)\right|,$$

$$D_{3n}(p)=n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left|\widetilde{R}_j-\overline{R}_j\right|\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-j}\left(u_tu_{t+j}^{(2)}+u_{t+j}u_t^{(2)}\right)\right|,$$

$$D_{4n}(p)=n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left|\widetilde{R}_j-\overline{R}_j\right|.$$

By Assumption K and M and by Lemma B.3, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} D_{1n}(p)\right] \leq Cn\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \operatorname{Var}^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{R}_j\right)\left|\mathbb{E}\left[u_t u_{t+j}^{(1)} + u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}\right]\right| \leq Cn^{1/2},$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} D_{2n}(p)\right] &\leq Cn^{1/2}\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \operatorname{Var}^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{R}_j\right)\\ &\quad\times \mathbb{E}^{1/2}\left[\left|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left(u_t u_{t+j}^{(1)} + u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)} - \mathbb{E}\left[u_t u_{t+j}^{(1)} + u_{t+j}u_t^{(1)}\right]\right)\right|^2\right]\\ &\leq C\overline{p}_n,\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} D_{3n}(p)\right] \leq Cn\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \operatorname{Var}^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{R}_j\right)\mathbb{E}^{1/2}\left[\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left(u_t u_{t+j}^{(2)} + u_{t+j}u_t^{(2)}\right)\right|^2\right] \leq C\overline{p}_n n^{1/2},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} D_{4n}(p)\right] \leq Cn\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\widetilde{R}_j - \overline{R}_j\right|\right] \leq Cn\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \operatorname{Var}^{1/2}\left(\widetilde{R}_j\right) \leq Cn^{1/2}\overline{p}_n.$$

The Markov inequality gives us the stochastic orders of magnitude of the four maxima in the bound for $\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]} D_n(p)$. Since $\overline{p}_n = O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$ by Assumption P, $\max_{t\in[1,n]}|\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}_t| = o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1/n\right)$ and $n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{n} e_t^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1})$ by Assumption M, we have $\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}|D_n(p)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1+\frac{\overline{p}_n}{n^{1/2}}\right) = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)$. This together with $\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}|C_n(p)/\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{p} R_j^2\right)^{1/2}| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)$ shows that the Lemma is proved. ☐

C.6. **Proof of Proposition B.3.** The proof of Proposition B.3 is long and divided in three setps. In the two first steps, we focus on directly observed residuals. In the first step, we approximate the sample covariance $\widetilde{R}_j$ by a martingale counterpart $\sum_{t=1}^{n} D_{jt}/n$, $j\in[1,\overline{p}_n]$, as in Shao (2011b), see the notations below and Lemmas C.2, C.3. and C.4. The second step deals with the deviation probability of

$$\frac{n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=j+1}^{n} D_{jt}\right)^2\left(K^2\left(j/p\right) - K^2\left(1\right)\right) - \sigma^4 E_{\Delta}\left(p\right)}{\sigma^4 V_{\Delta}\left(p\right)}$$

which is approximated with some Gaussian counterparts through the Lindeberg technique, see Lemma C.5. The third step concludes and explicitely deals with the case of estimated residuals thanks to Propositions B.1 and B.2.

Let us now introduce additional notations. Let $\mathcal{F}_k$ be the sigma field generated by $e_k, e_{k-1}, \ldots$. Define $\mathbf{P}_t\left[Z\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[Z\left|\mathcal{F}_t\right.\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[Z\left|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right.\right]$. Wu (2007, Proposition 3) establishes that $\left\|\mathbf{P}_t\left[u_{t+k}\right]\right\|_a \leq \delta_a\left(k\right)$ and Shao (2011b) has shown that

$$\left\|\mathbf{P}_0\left[u_k u_{k-j}\right]\right\|_a \leq 2\left\|u_k\right\|_{2a}\left(\delta_{2a}\left(k\right) + \delta_{2a}\left(k-j\right)\mathbb{I}\left(j \leq k\right)\right), \tag{C.3}$$

which is smaller than $4\left\|u_k\right\|_{2a}\delta_{2a}\left(k-j\right)$ when $j \leq k$. Define now the vector of martingale difference $D_t = \left[D_{1t}, \ldots, D_{\overline{p}_n t}\right]'$ with

$$D_{jt} = \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_t\left[u_k u_{k-j}\right]$$

which converges a.s. and satisfies $\mathbb{E}\left[D_{jt}\left|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right.\right] = 0$, $\max_j \mathbb{E}\left[\left|D_{jt}\right|^a\right] < \infty$, provided $\left\|u_t\right\|_{2a} < \infty$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\delta_{2a}\left(k\right) < \infty$. Consider the martingale $M_j = M_{jn} = \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} D_{jt}$ which is an approximation of $\widetilde{R}_j$. Shao (Lemma A.1, 2011b) gives under Assumption R and for any $\mathfrak{a} \in \left[1, 6a\right]$,

$$\left(\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left|\sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j} - M_j\right|^{\mathfrak{a}}\right]\right)^2 \leq C. \tag{C.4}$$

We shall also use a $\mathfrak{p}$-dependent version of D_t, denoted $D_t^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}$, with entries

$$D_{jt}^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1} = \mathbb{E}\left[D_{jt}\left|e_t, \ldots, e_{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right.\right] = \sum_{k=t}^{\infty}\mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_k u_{k-j}\right], \text{ where} \tag{C.5}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_t'\left[Z\right] = \mathbf{P}_t^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\left[Z\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[Z\left|e_t, \ldots, e_{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right.\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[Z\left|e_{t-1}, \ldots, e_{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right.\right].$$

Arguing as in Shao (2011b, Lemma A.2-(iii)) gives

$$\left\|D_{jt} - D_{jt}^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq C\left\|u_t\right\|_{2\mathfrak{a}}\Theta_{2\mathfrak{a}}\left(\mathfrak{p}-j\right), \quad \text{for all } j \in \left[1, \mathfrak{p}\right]. \tag{C.6}$$

C.6.1. *Martingale approximation and preliminary lemmas.* An important property of D_t and $D_t^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}$ is as follows.

Lemma C.2. *Suppose Assumption K and R hold. Let K_{jp} be as in (C.1). Then for any $p \leq \mathfrak{p}$, t, and any $s \leq t-\mathfrak{p}$, $\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} D_{jt}^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right\|_{3a} \leq Cp^{1/2}$.*

Proof of Lemma C.2. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} D_{jt}^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right\|_{3a} \\
&\quad = \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \sum_{k_1=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1} u_{s+k_1-j}\right] \sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right]\right\|_{3a} \\
&\quad \leq \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \sum_{k_1=0}^{j-1} \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1} u_{s+k_1-j}\right] \sum_{k_2=0}^{j-1} \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right]\right\|_{3a} && \text{(C.7)} \\
&\quad + \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \sum_{k_1=0}^{j-1} \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1} u_{s+k_1-j}\right] \sum_{k_2=j}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right]\right\|_{3a} && \text{(C.8)} \\
&\quad + \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \sum_{k_1=j}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1} u_{s+k_1-j}\right] \sum_{k_2=0}^{j-1} \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right]\right\|_{3a} && \text{(C.9)} \\
&\quad + \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \sum_{k_1=j}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1} u_{s+k_1-j}\right] \sum_{k_2=j}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right]\right\|_{3a}. && \text{(C.10)}
\end{aligned}
$$

We have for (C.7)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{(C.7)} &= \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \sum_{k_1=0}^{p-1} \mathbb{I}\left(k_1<j\right) u_{s+k_1-j} \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1}\right] \sum_{k_2=0}^{p-1} \mathbb{I}\left(k_2<j\right) u_{t+k_2-j} \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2}\right]\right\|_{3a} \\
&= \left\|\sum_{k_1=0}^{p-1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{p-1}\left(\sum_{j=k_1 \vee k_2}^{p-1} K_{jp} u_{s+k_1-j} u_{t+k_2-j}\right) \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1}\right] \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2}\right]\right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq \sum_{k_1=0}^{p-1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{p-1}\left\|\sum_{j=k_1 \vee k_2}^{p-1} K_{jp} u_{s+k_1-j} u_{t+k_2-j}\right\|_{6a} \delta_{12a}\left(k_1\right) \delta_{12a}\left(k_2\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

using $\|\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2}]\|_{12a} \leq \|\mathbf{P}_t[u_{t+k_2}]\|_{12a} = \delta_{12a}(k_2)$. Now (C.4) and the Burkholder inequality give

$$\left\|\sum_{j=k_1\vee k_2}^{p-1} K_{jp} u_{s+k_1-j} u_{t+k_2-j}\right\|_{6a} \leq \left\|\sum_{j=k_1\vee k_2}^{p-1} K_{jp} D_{t+k_2-j,t-s+k_2-k_1}\right\|_{6a}$$
$$+\left\|\sum_{j=k_1\vee k_2}^{p-1} K_{jp}\left(u_{s+k_1-j}u_{t+k_2-j} - D_{t+k_2-j,t-s+k_2-k_1}\right)\right\|_{6a} \leq Cp^{1/2}.$$

Hence (C.7) is smaller than $Cp^{1/2}$. For (C.8), we have since $\{u_{s+k_1-j}, j\in[1,k_1]\}$ and $\{\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2}u_{t+k_2-j}], j\in[1,k_1], k_2\geq 0\}$ are independent,

$$\text{(C.8)} = \left\|\sum_{k_1=0}^{p-1}\sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{j=k_1}^{p-1} K_{jp} u_{s+k_1-j}\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2+j}u_{t+k_2}]\right)\mathbf{P}_s[u_{s+k_1}]\right\|_{3a}$$
$$\leq \sum_{k_1=0}^{p-1}\sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty}\left\|\sum_{j=k_1}^{p-1} K_{jp} u_{s+k_1-j}\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2+j}u_{t+k_2}]\right\|_{6a}\delta_{6a}(k_1).$$

Let $d_t = \sum_{k=t}^{\infty}\mathbf{P}_t[u_k]$ be the martingale difference approximation of u_t, see Wu (2007). Now, since $\{u_{s+k_1-j}, d_{s+k_1-j}, j\in[1,k_1]\}$ and $\{\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2}u_{t+k_2-j}], j\in[1,k_1], k_2\geq 0\}$ are independent, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1 in Wu (2007), (C.4) and the Burkholder inequality give

$$\left\|\sum_{j=k_1}^{p-1} K_{jp} u_{s+k_1-j}\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2+j}u_{t+k_2}]\right\|_{6a}^2$$
$$\leq 2\left\|\sum_{j=k_1}^{p-1} K_{jp} d_{s+k_1-j}\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2+j}u_{t+k_2}]\right\|_{6a}^2 + 2\left\|\sum_{j=k_1}^{p-1} K_{jp}\left(u_{s+k_1-j}-d_t\right)\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2+j}u_{t+k_2}]\right\|_{6a}^2$$
$$\leq C\left\|\sum_{j=k_1}^{p-1} K_{jp} d_{s+k_1-j}^2\left(\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2+j}u_{t+k_2}]\right)^2\right\|_{3a} + C\left\|\mathbf{P}_t'[u_{t+k_2+j}u_{t+k_2}]\right\|_{6a}^2 \leq Ck_1\delta_{6a}^2(k_2).$$

Hence Assumption R gives (C.8)$\leq \sum_{k_1=0}^{p-1}\sum_{k_2=0}^{\infty} k_1\delta_{6a}^2(k_2)\delta_{6a}(k_1) \leq C$.

For (C.9), observe first that (C.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(C.9)} &= \left\| \sum_{k_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_2=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \mathbb{I}\left(j \leq k_1\right) \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1} u_{s+k_1-j}\right] \mathbb{I}\left(k_2 < j\right) \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right] \right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq \sum_{k_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_2=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=k_2}^{p} \mathbb{I}\left(j \leq k_1\right) \delta_{6a}\left(k_1 - j\right) \left\| \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right] \right\|_{6a} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{k_1=0}^{\infty} \delta_{6a}\left(k_1\right) \right) \times \sum_{k_2=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=k_2}^{p} \left\| \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right] \right\|_{6a}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\overline{u}_{t+k_2-j}^{t}$ is independent of $e_t, \ldots, e_{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}$ and $\mathbf{P}_t\left[u_{t+k_2}\right]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right] \right\|_{6a} &\leq \left\| \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[\overline{u}_{t+k_2-j}^{t} \mathbf{P}_t\left[u_{t+k_2}\right] | e_t, \ldots, e_{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right]}_{0} \right\|_{6a} \\
&+ \left\| \mathbb{E}\left[\left(u_{t+k_2-j} - \overline{u}_{t+k_2-j}^{t}\right) \mathbf{P}_t\left[u_{t+k_2}\right] | e_t, \ldots, e_{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}\right] \right\|_{6a} \\
&\leq \left\| u_{t+k_2-j} - \overline{u}_{t+k_2-j}^{t} \right\|_{12a} \left\| \mathbf{P}_t\left[u_{t+k_2}\right] \right\|_{12a} \leq \Theta_{12a}\left(k_2 - j\right) \delta_{12a}\left(k_2\right). \qquad \text{(C.11)}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting gives that (C.9)$\leq C \sum_{k_2=0}^{p-1} \sum_{j=k_2}^{p} \Theta_{12a}\left(k_2 - j\right) \delta_{12a}\left(k_2\right) \leq C$.

For (C.10), (C.3) and (C.11) give

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(C.10)} &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left(\sum_{k_1=j}^{\infty} \left\| \mathbf{P}_s\left[u_{s+k_1} u_{s+k_1-j}\right] \right\|_{6a} \right) \sum_{k_2=j}^{\infty} \left\| \mathbf{P}_t'\left[u_{t+k_2} u_{t+k_2-j}\right] \right\|_{6a} \\
&\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left(\sum_{k_1=j}^{\infty} \delta_{6a}\left(k_1 - j\right) \right) \sum_{k_2=j}^{\infty} \Theta_{12a}\left(k_2 - j\right) \delta_{12a}\left(k_2\right) \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence substituting gives $\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} D_{jt}^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1} \right\|_{3a} \leq C p^{1/2}$. □

We now define a suitable sequence of Gaussian vector. Let $2\overline{p}_n \leq \ell \leq 3\overline{p}_n$ be an integer number. Consider a sequence of independent centered Gaussian vectors $\eta_t = \left[\eta_{1t}, \ldots, \eta_{\overline{p}_n t}\right]'$ with

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\eta_{j_1 t} \eta_{j_2 t}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[D_{j_1 t}^{t-\ell+1} D_{j_2 t}^{t-\ell+1}\right]. \qquad \text{(C.12)}$$

We shall also assume that $\{\eta_t\}$ and $\{e_t\}$ are independent.

Lemma C.3. *Let* $\{\eta_t\}$ *be as in (C.12) and suppose Assumption R holds. Then for all* $p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]$ *and* $t, s \in [1, n]$,

$$\sum_{j_1 \neq j_2 \in [1, \overline{p}_n]} \left|\mathrm{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1 t}, \eta_{j_2 t}\right)\right| \leq C \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \left|\mathrm{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right) - \sigma^4\right| \leq C,$$

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^{p} \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right) K_{jp} \left(\mathrm{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right) - \sigma^4\right)\right| \leq C,$$

$$\left|\left(2 \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right)^2 K_{jp}^2 \mathrm{Var}^2\left(\eta_{jt}\right)\right)^{1/2} - \sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)\right| \leq C,$$

$$\mathrm{Var}\left(\frac{1}{p^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} \eta_{jt} \left| D_s \right.\right) \leq \frac{C}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}^2 D_{js}^2.$$

Proof of Lemma C.3. (C.4) gives for all j_1, j_2,

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left(D_{j_1 t}, D_{j_2 t}\right) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathrm{Cov}\left(\frac{\sum_{t=j_1+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j_1}}{\left(n - j_1\right)^{1/2}}, \frac{\sum_{t=j_2+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j_2}}{\left(n - j_2\right)^{1/2}}\right) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[u_0 u_{j_1} u_k u_{k+j_2}\right],$$

see also Lemma A.2 in Shao (2011b), provided $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left|\mathbb{E}\left[u_0 u_{j_1} u_k u_{k+j_2}\right]\right| < \infty$ as shown below. (C.6) and (C.12) give

$$\max_{j_1, j_2 \in [0, \overline{p}_n]} \left|\mathrm{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1 t}, \eta_{j_2 t}\right) - \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[u_0 u_{j_1} u_k u_{k+j_2}\right]\right| \leq C \Theta_{12a}\left(\overline{p}_n\right). \tag{C.13}$$

Now relation between cumulants and moments in Brillinger (2001) and Theorem C.1 gives absolute summability of the 4th moments. Hence $\Theta_{12a}\left(\overline{p}_n\right) = O(\overline{p}_n^{-6})$ gives the first bound of the Lemma. For the second and the third bound, observe that under the null

$$\left|\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[u_0 u_j u_k u_{k+j}\right] - \sigma^4\right| \leq \left|\mathbb{E}\left[u_0^2 u_j^2\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[u_0^2\right] \mathbb{E}\left[u_j^2\right]\right| + 2 \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[u_0 u_j u_k u_{k+j}\right]\right|.$$

$\left|\mathbb{E}\left[u_0^2 u_j^2\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[u_0^2\right]\mathbb{E}\left[u_j^2\right]\right| \leq C\Theta_{12a}(j) = O\left(j^{-6}\right)$ and absolute summability of the 4th moments gives the second bound. This also gives the fourth one since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left(2\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)^2 K_{jp}^2 \operatorname{Var}^2\left(\eta_{jt}\right)\right)^{1/2} - \sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)\right| \\
&\leq \left(2\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)^2 K_{jp}^2 \left(\operatorname{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right)-\sigma^4\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq 2^{1/2}\left|\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right) K_{jp}\left(\operatorname{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right)-\sigma^4\right)\right| \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

For the last one, observe first that

$$\sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq \overline{p}_n}\left|\operatorname{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1t},\eta_{j_2t}\right)\right|^2 \leq \left(\sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq \overline{p}_n}\left|\operatorname{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1t},\eta_{j_2t}\right)\right|\right)^2 < \infty$$

by Theorem C.1 since the 2th cumulants are the covariance. This gives, for any $z = \left[z_1,\ldots,z_{\overline{p}_n}\right]'$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var}\left(z'\eta\right) = z'\mathbb{E}\left[\eta\eta'\right]z &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\operatorname{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right)z_j^2 + 2\sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq \overline{p}_n}\left|\operatorname{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1t},\eta_{j_2t}\right)\right|\left|z_{j_1}\right|\left|z_{j_2}\right| \\
&\leq Czz' + 2\left(\sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq \overline{p}_n}\left|\operatorname{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1t},\eta_{j_2t}\right)\right|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq \overline{p}_n} z_{j_1}^2 z_{j_2}^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq Cz'z.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\operatorname{Var}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}D_{js}\eta_{jt}\left|D_s\right.\right) \leq C\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}^2 D_{js}^2\right)^{1/2}$ since $\{D_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ are independent. □

C.6.2. *The deviation probability of the maximum of Proposition B.3.* The proof is based on a smooth approximation of the maximum of real numbers $x_1,\ldots,x_{\overline{p}_n}$. Consider an increasing and three times continuously differentiable real function f with

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} f(x) = 1, \quad f(x) = x \text{ for } x \geq 2, \quad \max_{i=1,2,3}\sup_x\left|f^{(i)}(x)\right| < \infty. \tag{C.14}$$

Let $e = e_n \to \infty$ with $\ln(\overline{p}_n)/e = o(1)$. Then $\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\{f(x_p)\} \leq \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} f^e(x_p)\right)^{1/e} \leq \overline{p}_n^{1/e}\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\{f(x_p)\}$ gives that

$$\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} f^e(x_p)\right)^{1/e} = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\ln \overline{p}_n}{e}\right)\right)\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\{f(x_p)\}. \tag{C.15}$$

We will first find a suitable approximation for the distribution of

$$\mathcal{M} = \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} f^e(\check{s}_p)\right)^{1/e} \quad \text{where } \check{S}_p = n\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(\frac{M_{jn}}{n}\right)^2, \quad \check{s}_p = \frac{\check{S}_p - \sigma^4 E_\Delta(p)}{\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)}. \tag{C.16}$$

Define, for $\eta = \left[\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_{\overline{p}_n}\right]'$ and $x \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{jt}(x;\eta) &= \sum_{s=j+1}^{t-1} D_{js} + x\eta_j + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n}\eta_{js}, \quad R_{jt}(x;\eta) = \frac{M_{jt}(x;\eta)}{n}\\
\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta) &= \frac{n\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}R_{jt}^2(x;\eta) - \sigma^4 E_\Delta(p)}{\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)}, \quad \Sigma_t(x;\eta) = f(\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta)),\\
\mathcal{M}_t(x;\eta) &= \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_t^e(x;\eta)\right)^{\frac{1}{e}}, \quad \mathcal{M}_t(\eta) = \mathcal{M}_t(1;\eta),
\end{aligned} \tag{C.17}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta) &= \frac{d\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta)}{dx} = \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(\sum_{s=j+1}^{t-1} D_{js} + x\eta_j + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n}\eta_{js}\right)\eta_j}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)},\\
\check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(x;\eta) &= \frac{d_{pt}^2\check{s}(x;\eta)}{dx^2} = \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\eta_j^2}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)},\\
\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta) &= f^{(1)}(\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta))\,\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta),\\
\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}(x;\eta) &= f^{(2)}(\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta))\left(\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta)\right)^2 + f^{(1)}(\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta))\,\check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(x;\eta),\\
\Sigma_{pt}^{(3)}(x;\eta) &= f^{(3)}(\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta))\left(\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta)\right)^3 + 3f^{(2)}(\check{s}_{pt}(x;\eta))\,\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta)\,\check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(x;\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

We first bound the moments of $\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta)$, $\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}(x;\eta)$ and $\Sigma_{pt}^{(3)}(x;\eta)$ when η is set to D_t or η_t.

Lemma C.4. *Under Assumption R and if* $\overline{p}_n = O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$*, we have uniformly in* $p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]$*,* $x \in [0,1]$ *and* $t = 1, \ldots, n$*,*

$$\max\left\{\left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}(x; D_t)\right\|_{3a}, \left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}(x; \eta_t)\right\|_{3a}\right\} \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}, \tag{C.18}$$

$$\max\left\{\left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}(x; D_t)\right\|_{3a/2}, \left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}(x; \eta_t)\right\|_{3a/2}\right\} \leq \frac{Cp^{1/2}}{n}, \tag{C.19}$$

$$\max\left\{\left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(3)}(x; D_t)\right\|_{a}, \left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(3)}(x; \eta_t)\right\|_{a}\right\} \leq \frac{Cp^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}}. \tag{C.20}$$

Proof of Lemma C.4. (C.14) gives

$$\left|\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}(x; \eta)\right| \leq C\left|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; \eta)\right|, \quad \left|\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}(x; \eta)\right| \leq C\left(\left(\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; \eta)\right)^2 + \left|\check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(x; \eta)\right|\right),$$
$$\left|\Sigma_{pt}^{(3)}(x; \eta)\right| \leq C\left|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; \eta)\right|\left(\left(\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; \eta)\right)^2 + \left|\check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(x; \eta)\right|\right). \tag{C.21}$$

(C.21) shows that the lemma directly follows from

$$\max\left\{\left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; D_t)\right\|_{3a}, \left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; \eta_t)\right\|_{3a}\right\} \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}, \tag{C.22}$$

$$\max\left\{\left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(x; D_t)\right\|_{3a/2}, \left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(x; \eta_t)\right\|_{3a/2}\right\} \leq \frac{Cp^{1/2}}{n}. \tag{C.23}$$

(C.23) directly follow from the triangular inequality. For (C.22), we first bound $\left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; D_t)\right\|_{3a}$. We have

$$\left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(x; D_t)\right\|_{3a} \leq C\left\|\frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} D_{jt}\right)}{np^{1/2}}\right\|_{3a} \tag{C.24}$$

$$+ C\left\|\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{jt}^2}{np^{1/2}}\right\|_{3a} + C\left\|\frac{\sum_{s=t+1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{jt} \eta_{js}\right)}{np^{1/2}}\right\|_{3a}. \tag{C.25}$$

We have, for the first item (C.24)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{(C.24)} &\leq \left\| \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} D_{jt} \sum_{s=1}^{t-\mathfrak{p}} K_{jp} D_{js}}{np^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} + \left\| \frac{\sum_{s=t-\mathfrak{p}+1}^{t-1} D_{jt} \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js}}{np^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} D_{jt} \sum_{s=1}^{t-\mathfrak{p}} K_{jp} D_{js}}{np^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} + \frac{1}{np^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left\| K_{jp} D_{jt} \right\|_{6a} \left\| \sum_{s=t-\mathfrak{p}+1}^{t-1} D_{js} \right\|_{6a} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-\mathfrak{p}} K_{jp} \sum_{j=1}^{p} D_{jt} D_{js}}{np^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} + \frac{Cp^{1/2}\mathfrak{p}^{1/2}}{n},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathfrak{p} \geq p$ and by the Burkholder inequality. Now let $\widetilde{D}_{jt} = D_{jt}^{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}$ be as in (C.5). Since $\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} \widetilde{D}_{jt}$ is a difference of martingale given $e_t, \ldots, e_{t-\mathfrak{p}+1}$, (C.6), the Burkholder and triangular inequalities, Lemma C.2 give

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{s=1}^{t-\mathfrak{p}} K_{jp} D_{js} D_{jt}}{np^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-\mathfrak{p}} \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} \widetilde{D}_{jt}}{np^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} + \frac{1}{np^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left| K_{jp} \right| \left\| \sum_{s=1}^{t-\mathfrak{p}} D_{js} \right\|_{6a} \left\| D_{jt} - \widetilde{D}_{jt} \right\|_{6a} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{np^{1/2}} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-\mathfrak{p}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} \widetilde{D}_{jt} \right\|_{3a}^{2} \right)^{1/2} + C \frac{\Theta_{6a}(\mathfrak{p}-p)}{p^{1/2}} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{np^{1/2}} \left(|t-\mathfrak{p}| \, p \right)^{1/2} + C \frac{\Theta_{6a}(\mathfrak{p}-p)}{p^{1/2}} \leq C \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{\Theta_{6a}(\mathfrak{p}-p)}{p^{1/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence substituting gives

$$
\left\| \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} D_{js} D_{jt} \right)}{np^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} \leq C \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{p^{1/2}\mathfrak{p}^{1/2}}{n} + \frac{\Theta_{6a}(\mathfrak{p}-p)}{p^{1/2}} \right). \tag{C.26}
$$

For the first item in (C.25), (C.23) gives a bound $C/n^{1/2}$. For the second item in (C.25), conditional Gaussianity of the $\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}D_{jt}\eta_{js}\right\}$ and Lemma C.3 give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\frac{\sum_{s=t+1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}D_{jt}\eta_{js}\right)}{np^{1/2}}\right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{np^{1/2}}\left\|\left\{\sum_{s=t+1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}^{2}D_{jt}^{2}\right)\right\}^{1/2}\right\|_{3a} \leq \frac{C}{np^{1/2}}\left\|\sum_{s=t+1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}^{2}D_{jt}^{2}\right)\right\|_{3a/2}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{np^{1/2}}\left(\sum_{s=t+1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}^{2}\left\|D_{jt}\right\|_{3a}^{2}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C}{np^{1/2}}\left(\left(n-t\right)p\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the two last bounds in (C.25) and (C.26) in (C.24) shows that

$$\max\left\{\left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}\left(x;D_t\right)\right\|_{3a}, \left\|\check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}\left(x;\eta_t\right)\right\|_{3a}\right\} \leq C\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{p^{1/2}\mathfrak{p}^{1/2}}{n} + \frac{\Theta_{6a}\left(\mathfrak{p}-p\right)}{p^{1/2}}\right). \tag{C.27}$$

Observe that $\Theta_{6a}\left(\mathfrak{p}-p\right) \leq C\left(\mathfrak{p}-p\right)^{-11/2}$ by Assumption R. Consider now

$$\mathfrak{p} = \max\left(2p, \left(\frac{n}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}}\right) \geq 2p,$$

which is such that, since $p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]$ with $\overline{p}_n = O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{If } \left(\frac{n}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \geq 2p,\ \frac{\left(\mathfrak{p}-p\right)^{-11/2}}{p^{1/2}} \asymp \frac{p^{1/2}\mathfrak{p}^{1/2}}{n} \leq \frac{\mathfrak{p}}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n^{5/6}} \leq \frac{1}{n^{1/2}}, \\
&\text{If } \left(\frac{n}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} < 2p \Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{n}{2^6}\right)^{\frac{1}{7}} < p,\ \frac{\Theta_{6a}\left(\mathfrak{p}-p\right)}{p^{1/2}} \leq Cp^{-6} \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}},\ \frac{p^{1/2}\mathfrak{p}^{1/2}}{n} \leq \frac{\overline{p}_n}{n} \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (C.27) gives (C.22). □

Let $I\left(\cdot\right)$ be a three times differentiable real function and define for $\mathcal{M}_t\left(\eta\right)$ as in (C.17),

$$\mathcal{I}_t\left(\eta\right) = \mathcal{I}_{tn}\left(\eta\right) = I\left(\mathcal{M}_t\left(\eta\right)\right), \quad \mathcal{I}_t\left(x;\eta\right) = \mathcal{I}\left(x\eta\right), \quad \mathcal{I}_t^{(j)}\left(x;\eta\right) = \frac{d_t^j\mathcal{I}\left(x;\eta\right)}{d^jx}, \quad j=1,2.$$

Observe that $I\left(\mathcal{M}\right) = I\left(\mathcal{M}_n\left(D_n\right)\right) = \mathcal{I}_n\left(D_n\right)$, $\mathcal{I}_t\left(D_t\right) = \mathcal{I}_{t+1}\left(\eta_{t+1}\right)$, and that $I\left(\mathcal{M}_1\left(\eta_1\right)\right)$ $= \mathcal{I}_1\left(\eta_1\right)$ is a function of the Gaussian vectors $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$ only.

Lemma C.5. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_1(\eta_1)$ be as in (C.16) and (C.17). Consider a real function $I(\cdot)$ which may depend on n and three times continuously differentiable with $\max_{j=1,2,3}\sup_x \left|I^{(j)}(x)\right| \leq C$. Then under Assumptions P, R and if $e = O\left(\overline{p}_n^{1/(2a)}\right)$,*

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left[I(\mathcal{M}) - I(\mathcal{M}_1(\eta_1))\right]\right| \leq C\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+3/a}}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{\overline{p}_n^{1-1/a}}\right).$$

Proof of Lemma C.5. The proof of the Lemma works by changing D_n into η_n, D_{n-1} into η_{n-1} and so on, the so called Lindeberg technique described in Pollard (2002, p.179). This amounts to decompose $I(\mathcal{M}) - I(\mathcal{M}_n(\eta_n))$ into the following sum of differences,

$$\begin{aligned}
& I(\mathcal{M}) - I(\mathcal{M}_n(\eta_n)) \\
&\quad = \mathcal{I}_n(D_n) - \mathcal{I}_{n-1}(D_{n-1}) + \mathcal{I}_{n-1}(D_{n-1}) - \mathcal{I}_{n-2}(D_{n-2}) + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_1(D_1) - \mathcal{I}_1(\eta_1) \\
&\quad = \mathcal{I}_n(D_n) - \mathcal{I}_n(\eta_n) + \mathcal{I}_{n-1}(D_{n-1}) - \mathcal{I}_{n-1}(\eta_{n-1}) + \cdots + \mathcal{I}_1(D_1) - \mathcal{I}_1(\eta_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_t(\eta) = \mathcal{I}_t(1;\eta)$ and $\mathcal{I}_t(0;\eta) = \mathcal{I}_t(0)$, a third-order Taylor expansion around $\eta = 0$ with integral remainder gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\mathcal{I}_t(D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t(\eta_t)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(1)}(0;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t^{(1)}(0;\eta_t)\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(0;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right] + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (1-x)^2 \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;\eta_t)\right] dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\{D_t\}$ is a sequence of martingale difference, $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(1)}(0;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t^{(1)}(0;\eta_t)\right] = 0$ due to the expression of $\mathcal{I}_t^{(1)}(0;\eta)$ given above. Hence

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left[I(\mathcal{M})\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[I(\mathcal{M}_1(\eta_1))\right]\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}\left|\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(0;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]\right| \tag{C.28}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 (1-x)^2 \left\{\sum_{t=1}^n \left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;\eta_t)\right]\right|\right\} dx. \tag{C.29}$$

We now compute the differentials $\mathcal{I}_t^{(j)}(x;\eta)$, $j=1,2,3$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_t^{(1)}(x;\eta) &= I'\left(\mathcal{M}_t(x;\eta)\right)\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}(x;\eta)\,,\\
\mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(x;\eta) &= I''\left(\mathcal{M}_t(x;\eta)\right)\left(\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}(x;\eta)\right)^2 + I'\left(\mathcal{M}_t(x;\eta)\right)\mathcal{M}_t^{(2)}(x;\eta)\,,\\
\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;\eta) &= I'''\left(\mathcal{M}_t(x;\eta)\right)\left(\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}(x;\eta)\right)^3 + 3I''\left(\mathcal{M}_t(x;\eta)\right)\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}(x;\eta)\,\mathcal{M}_t^{(2)}(x;\eta)\\
&\qquad + I'\left(\mathcal{M}_t(x;\eta)\right)\mathcal{M}_t^{(3)}(x;\eta)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

We compute the differentials of $\mathcal{M}_t$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}(x;\eta) &= \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\bar{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^e(x;\eta)\right)^{1/e-1}\sum_{p=1}^{\bar{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}(x;\eta)\,\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta)\\
&= \mathcal{M}_t^{1-e}(x;\eta)\sum_{p=1}^{\bar{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}(x;\eta)\,\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}(x;\eta)\,,\\
\mathcal{M}_t^{(2)}(x;\eta) &= \mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(2)}(x;\eta) + \mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(2)}(x;\eta) + \mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(2)}(x;\eta)\,,\\
\mathcal{M}^{(3)}(x;\eta) &= \mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(3)}(x;\eta) + \cdots + \mathcal{M}_{6t}^{(3)}(x;\eta)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where, dropping the variables x, η for notational convenience

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(2)} &= \left(\frac{1}{e}-1\right)\mathcal{M}_t^{1-2e}\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^2, \\
\mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(2)} &= \mathcal{M}_t^{1-e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}, \\
\mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(2)} &= (e-1)\,\mathcal{M}_t^{1-e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-2}\left(\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^2, \\
\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(3)} &= \left(\frac{1}{e}-1\right)\left(\frac{1}{e}-2\right)\mathcal{M}_t^{1-3e}\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^3, \\
\mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(3)} &= 3\left(\frac{1}{e}-1\right)\mathcal{M}_t^{1-2e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}, \\
\mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(3)} &= 3\left(\frac{1}{e}-1\right)(e-1)\,\mathcal{M}_t^{1-2e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-2}\left(\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^2, \\
\mathcal{M}_{4t}^{(3)} &= (3e-1)\,\mathcal{M}_t^{1-e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-2}\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}, \\
\mathcal{M}_{5t}^{(3)} &= (e-1)\,(e-2)\,\mathcal{M}_t^{1-e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-2}\left(\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^3, \\
\mathcal{M}_{6t}^{(3)} &= \mathcal{M}_t^{1-e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The third-order item(C.29). Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1(1-x)^2\left\{\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;\eta_t)\right]\right|\right\}dx \\
&\quad\leq\frac{1}{2}\int_0^1(1-x)^2\left\{\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left(\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;D_t)\right]\right|+\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;\eta_t)\right]\right|\right)\right\}dx,
\end{aligned}$$

it is sufficient to bound $\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x)\right]\right|$ independently of x where $\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x)$ stands for $\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;\eta_t)$ or $\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x;D_t)$. We have, dropping dependence w.r.t. to x for ease of notation,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}\right]\right| \le C\sum_{t=1}^{n}&\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|^3\right]+\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(2)}\right|\right]+\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(2)}\right|\right]\right\}\\ &+C\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(2)}\right|\right]+\sum_{j=1}^{6}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{jt}^{(3)}\right|\right]\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We now study the ten items above.

(1) $\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|^3\right]$. We have for a, $\overline{a}\ge 1$ with $1/a = 1-1/\overline{a}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|^3\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{1-e}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right|^3\right]\\ &\le \sum_{p_1,p_2,p_3=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{3(1-e)}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_3t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{(1)}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{(1)}\Sigma_{p_3t}^{(1)}\right|\right]\\ &\le \max_{p,t}\left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right\|_{3a}^{3}\sum_{p_1,p_2,p_3=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{3(1-e)}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_3t}^{e-1}\right|^{\overline{a}}\right]\\ &\le \frac{C}{n^{3/2}}\sum_{p_1,p_2,p_3=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{3(1-e)}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_3t}^{e-1}\right|^{\overline{a}}\right],\end{aligned}$$

by (C.18) for all $x \in [0,1]$. Now, since $t \mapsto t^{1/\overline{a}}$, $t \mapsto t^{1-1/e}$ are concave and $\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} t_p^{\overline{a}} \leq \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} t_p\right)^{\overline{a}}$, the definition of $\mathcal{M}_t$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{p_1,p_2,p_3=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{3(1-e)}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_3t}^{e-1}\right|^{\overline{a}}\right]\\
&= \overline{p}_n^3 \times \frac{1}{\overline{p}_n^3}\sum_{p_1,p_2,p_3=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{3(1-e)}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_3t}^{e-1}\right|^{\overline{a}}\right]\\
&\leq \overline{p}_n^3\left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n^3}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{p_1,p_2,p_3=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\mathcal{M}_t^{3\overline{a}(1-e)}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{\overline{a}e(1-1/e)}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{\overline{a}e(1-1/e)}\Sigma_{p_3t}^{\overline{a}e(1-1/e)}\right]\right)^{1/\overline{a}}\\
&= \overline{p}_n^3\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e}\right)^{-3\overline{a}(1-1/e)}\left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{\overline{a}e(1-1/e)}\right)^3\right]\right)^{1/\overline{a}}\\
&\leq \overline{p}_n^3\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{\overline{a}e}\right)^{-3(1-1/e)}\left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{\overline{a}e}\right)^{3(1-1/e)}\right]\right)^{1/\overline{a}}\\
&\leq \overline{p}_n^{3(1-1/\overline{a})+3/(e\overline{a})} \leq C\overline{p}_n^{3/a},
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly w.r.t. to t since $(\ln \overline{p}_n)/e = o(1)$. Hence for all $x \in [0,1]$

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|^3\right] \leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{3/a}}{n^{1/2}}. \tag{C.30}$$

(2) $\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(2)}\right|\right]$. We have, since $\mathcal{M}_t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|\left|\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(2)}\right|\right] &\leq C\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{M}_t^{2-3e}\left|\sum_{p=2}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right|^3\right] \leq C\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{M}_t^{3-3e}\left|\sum_{p=2}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right|^3\right]\\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|^3\right],
\end{aligned}$$

for all t, such that $\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|^2\left|\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(2)}\right|\right] \leq C\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\right|^3\right]$. Hence a bound similar to (C.30) holds.

(3) $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(2)}\right|\right]$. Let $\overline{a} > 1$ be such that $1/\overline{a} = 1 - 1/a$. Arguing as for **(1)** with (C.18) and (C.19),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(2)}\right|\right] &\leq C \sum_{p_1,p_2=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{M}_t^{2(1-e)}\left|\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{(1)}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{(2)}\right|\right] \\
&\leq C \max_{p,t}\left\{\left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right\|_{3a}\left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}\right\|_{3a/2}\right\} \sum_{p_1,p_2=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{2(1-e)}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\right|^{\overline{a}}\right] \\
&\leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}} \times \overline{p}_n^2 \times \mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e}\right)^{-2\overline{a}(1-1/e)}\left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e\overline{a}(1-1/e)}\right)^2\right] \\
&\leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}} \times \overline{p}_n^2 \times \mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e\overline{a}(1-1/e)}\right)^{-2}\left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n}\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e\overline{a}(1-1/e)}\right)^2\right] \\
&= C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}} \times \overline{p}_n^2 \times \overline{p}_n^{-2/\overline{a}} = C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{\frac{1}{2}(1+4/a)}}{n^{3/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, uniformly w.r.t. $x \in [0,1]$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(2)}\right|\right] \leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{\frac{1}{2}(1+4/a)}}{n^{1/2}}. \tag{C.31}$$

(4) $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(2)}\right|\right]$. Proceeding as **(1)** and **(3)** gives, since $\inf_{p,t}\Sigma_{pt} \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(2)}\right|\right] \leq Ce\sum_{p_1,p_2=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{M}_t^{2(1-e)}\left|\Sigma_{p_1t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_2t}^{e-1}\Sigma_{p_1t}^{(1)}\left(\Sigma_{p_2t}^{(1)}\right)^2\right|\right] \leq C\frac{e\overline{p}_n^{2/a}}{n^{3/2}} \leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{3/a}}{n^{3/2}},$$

provided $e = O(\overline{p}_n^{1/a})$. Hence $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_t^{(1)}\mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(2)}\right|\right]$ can be bounded as in (C.30).

(5) $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$ can be bounded as in (C.30) since $\mathcal{M}_t \geq 1$ gives $\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{1t}^{(3)}\right|\right] \leq C\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{M}_t^{3(1-e)}\left|\sum_{p=2}^{\overline{p}_n}\Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right|^3\right]$.

(6) $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$. Arguing as in **(3)** gives that $\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{2t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$ can be bounded as in (C.31).

(7) $\sum_{t=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{3t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$. Arguing as in **(4)** shows that this item is negligible compared to (C.30).

(8) $\sum_{t=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{4t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$. Let $\overline{a} > 1$ be such that $1/\overline{a} = 1 - 1/a$. We have, since $\inf_{p,t} \Sigma_{pt} \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{4t}^{(3)}\right|\right] &\leq Ce\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{M}_t^{1-e} \sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \left|\Sigma_{pt}^{e-2} \Sigma_{pt}^{(2)} \Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right|\right] \leq Ce \sum_{p=p_o}^{\overline{p}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/\overline{a}}\left[\left(\mathcal{M}_t^{1-e} \Sigma_{pt}^{e-1}\right)^{\overline{a}}\right] \left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}\right\|_{3a/2} \left\|\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq C \frac{e \overline{p}_n^{1/2} \overline{p}_n^{1-1/\overline{a}}}{n^{3/2}} \leq C \frac{\overline{p}_n^{\frac{1}{2}(1+4/a)}}{n^{3/2}},
\end{aligned}$$

provided $e = O\left(\overline{p}_n^{1/a}\right)$. This gives a bound similar to (C.31) for $\sum_{t=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{4t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$.

(9) $\sum_{t=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{5t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$ can be bounded as in (C.30) provided $e = O(\overline{p}_n^{1/(2a)})$.

(10) $\sum_{t=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{M}_{6t}^{(3)}\right|\right]$ can be bounded as in (C.31).

Hence, collecting the dominant bounds (C.30) and (C.31) in **(1)-(10)** gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 (1-x)^2 \left\{\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x; D_t) - \mathcal{I}_t^{(3)}(x; \eta_t)\right]\right|\right\} dx \leq C \frac{\overline{p}_n^{\frac{3}{a}} + \overline{p}_n^{\frac{1}{2}(1+4/a)}}{n^{1/2}} \leq C \left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+\frac{4}{a}}}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{C.32}$$

The second-order term (C.28). Note that $\mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(0;\eta) = \eta' A_t \eta$ where A_t depends upon $D_1, \ldots, D_{t-1}$ and $\eta_{t+1}, \ldots, \eta_n$. In the standard Lindeberg method, $\{D_t, t \in [1,n]\}$ and $\{\eta_t, t \in [1,n]\}$ are both independent variables with identitical mean and variance, so that the second order term, which writes as a sum of items $\mathbb{E}\left[D_t' A_t D_t\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\eta_t' A_t \eta_t\right]$, is equal to 0 in this simpler case. However this does not hold in our case. In this step, the second order term is dealt with by removing from $\mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(0;\eta)$ a block $\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js}$ and by changing the D_{jt} into $D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1} = \mathbb{E}\left[D_{jt} \left| e_t, \ldots, e_{t-\ell+1}\right.\right]$.

Observe that $\mathcal{I}_t^{(2)}(0;\eta) = \mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;\eta) + \mathcal{I}_{2t}^{(2)}(0;\eta) + \mathcal{I}_{3t}^{(2)}(0;\eta) + \mathcal{I}_{4t}^{(2)}(0;\eta)$ with, dropping the dependence upon 0 and η,

$$\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)} = \left(\frac{1}{e} - 1\right) I_{tn}^{(1)} \mathcal{M}_t^{1-2e} \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \Sigma_{pt}^{e-1} \Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^2, \quad I_{tn}^{(1)} = I'\left(\mathcal{M}_t\right),$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{2t}^{(2)} = I_{tn}^{(1)} \mathcal{M}_t^{1-e} \sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \Sigma_{pt}^{e-1} \Sigma_{pt}^{(2)}, \quad \mathcal{I}_{3t}^{(2)} = (e-1)\, I_{tn}^{(1)} \mathcal{M}_t^{1-e} \sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \Sigma_{pt}^{e-1} \left(\Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^2,$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{4t}^{(2)} = I''\left(\mathcal{M}_t\right) \left(\mathcal{M}_t^{1-e} \sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \Sigma_{pt}^{e-1} \Sigma_{pt}^{(1)}\right)^2.$$

Observe $\mathcal{M}_t\left(0; D_t\right) = \mathcal{M}_t\left(0; \eta_t\right)$ and $\Sigma_{pt}\left(0; D_t\right) = \Sigma_{pt}\left(0; \eta_t\right)$ and that these quantities do not depend upon η_t or D_t. We shall first focus on $\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}$. Let $\ell \geq 2\overline{p}_n$ be an integer number. Define, for $y \in [0,1]$,

$$\mathfrak{S}_{pt}\left(y; \eta\right) = \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \left(\sum_{s=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js} + y \sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n} \eta_{js}\right) \eta_j}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta\left(p\right)},$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{pt}\left(y\right) = \mathfrak{S}_{pt}\left(y; y D_t + (1-y)\, D_t^{t-\ell+1}\right),$$

$$\mathfrak{T}_{pt}\left(y; \eta\right) = \check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(y; \eta) = \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \eta_j^2}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta\left(p\right)}, \quad \mathfrak{T}_{pt}\left(y\right) = \mathfrak{T}_{pt}\left(y; y D_t + (1-y)\, D_t^{t-\ell+1}\right),$$

which are such that $\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(1;\eta) = \check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(0;\eta)$, $\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(1) = \check{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(0;D_t)$, $\mathfrak{T}_{pt}(1) = \check{s}_{pt}^{(2)}(0;D_t)$. Define also

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}_{jt}(y) &= \sum_{s=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js} + y\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n} \eta_{js}, \quad \mathbf{R}_{jt}(y) = \frac{\mathbf{M}_{jt}(y)}{n},\\
\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y) &= \frac{n\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\mathbf{R}_{jt}^2(y) - \sigma^4 E_\Delta(p)}{\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}(y) = f(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)),\\
\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y;\eta) &= f^{(1)}(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y))\,\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y;\eta),\\
\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2)}(y;\eta) &= f^{(1)}(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y))\,\mathfrak{T}_{pt}(y;\eta) + f^{(2)}(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y))\,(\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y;\eta))^2,\\
\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y) &= \widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}\left(y; yD_t + (1-y)D_t^{t-\ell+1}\right),\\
\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2)}(y;\eta) &= \widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2)}\left(y; yD_t + (1-y)D_t^{t-\ell+1}\right),\\
\mathfrak{M}_t(y) &= \left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^e(y)\right)^{\frac{1}{e}}, \quad \mathfrak{I}_{tn}^{(1)}(y) = I'(\mathfrak{M}_t(y)),
\end{aligned}$$

and the counterpart of $\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{I}_t(y;\eta) &= \left(\frac{1}{e}-1\right)\mathfrak{I}_{tn}^{(1)}(y)\,\mathfrak{M}_t^{1-2e}(y)\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y;\eta)\right)^2,\\
\mathfrak{I}_t(y) &= \mathfrak{I}_t\left(y; yD_t + (1-y)D_t^{t-\ell+1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t) = \mathfrak{I}_t(1;\eta_t)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;D_t) = \mathfrak{I}_t(1)$. Hence $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{I}_t(1) - \mathfrak{I}_t(1;\eta_t)\right]$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;D_t) - \mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{I}_t(0) - \mathfrak{I}_t(0;\eta_t)\right] \qquad \text{(C.33)}\\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{I}_t^{(1)}(y) - \mathfrak{I}_t^{(1)}(y;\eta_t)\right] dy, \qquad \text{(C.34)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{I}_t^{(1)}(y) = d\mathfrak{I}_t(y)/dy$ and $\mathfrak{I}_t^{(1)}(y;\eta_t) = d\mathfrak{I}_t(y;\eta_t)/dy$.

We first consider the integral item $\int_0^1 \left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{I}_t^{(1)}(y)\right]\right| dy$ from (C.34) and first compute $\mathfrak{I}_{1t}^{(1)}(y)$. Define

$$\mathfrak{S}_{pt}^{(1)}(y) = \frac{d\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y)}{dy} = \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js}\right)\left(yD_{jt} + (1-y)\, D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1}\right)}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)}$$
$$+ \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(\sum_{s=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js} + y\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n} \eta_{js}\right)\left(D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1} - D_{jt}\right)}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)},$$

$$\mathfrak{T}_{pt}^{(1)}(y) = \frac{d\mathfrak{T}_{pt}(y)}{dy} = \frac{4\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(yD_{jt} + (1-y)\, D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1}\right)\left(D_{jt} - D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1}\right)}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)},$$

$$\mathbf{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(y) = \frac{d\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)}{dy} = \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\mathbf{M}_{jt}(y)\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js}}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)},$$

$$\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1,1)}(y) = \frac{d\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)}{dy} = f^{(2)}\left(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)\right)\mathbf{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\,\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y) + f^{(1)}\left(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)\right)\mathfrak{S}_{pt}^{(1)}(y),$$

$$\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2,1)}(y) = \frac{d\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2)}(y)}{dy} = f^{(2)}\left(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)\right)\mathbf{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\,\mathfrak{T}_{pt}(y) + f^{(1)}\left(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)\right)\mathfrak{T}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)$$
$$+ f^{(3)}\left(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)\right)\mathbf{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\left(\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y)\right)^2 + 2f^{(2)}\left(\mathbf{s}_{pt}(y)\right)\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y)\,\mathfrak{S}_{pt}^{(1)}(y),$$

$$\mathfrak{I}_{tn}^{(2)}(y) = I''\left(\mathfrak{M}_t(y)\right),$$

and

$$\mathfrak{I}_{1t}^{(1)}(y) = \left(\frac{1}{e} - 1\right)\mathfrak{I}_{tn}^{(2)}(y)\,\mathfrak{M}_t^{2-3e}(y)\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right)^2 \sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y),$$

$$\mathfrak{I}_{2t}^{(1)}(y) = \left(\frac{1}{e} - 1\right)\left(\frac{1}{e} - 2\right)\mathfrak{I}_{tn}^{(1)}(y)\,\mathfrak{M}_t^{1-3e}(y)\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right)^2 \sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y),$$

$$\mathfrak{I}_{3t}^{(1)}(y) = 2\left(\frac{1}{e} - 1\right)(e-1)\,\mathfrak{I}_{tn}^{(1)}(y)\,\mathfrak{M}_t^{1-2e}(y)\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right)\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-2}(y)\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right)^2\right),$$

$$\mathfrak{I}_{4t}^{(1)}(y) = 2\left(\frac{1}{e} - 1\right)\mathfrak{I}_{tn}^{(1)}(y)\,\mathfrak{M}_t^{1-2e}(y)\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right)\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{e-1}(y)\,\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1,1)}(y)\right).$$

To bound the moments of $\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)$, $\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1,1)}(y)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)$, consider first $\left\|\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y)\right\|_{3a}$, $\left\|\mathfrak{S}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a}$ and $\left\|\mathbf{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a}$. For $\left\|\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y)\right\|_{3a}$ and $\left\|\mathfrak{S}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a}$, (C.18), the Burkholder inequality, (C.6) $\overline{p}_n = O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$, $2\overline{p}_n \leq \ell \leq 3\overline{p}_n$ and $\Theta_{6a}\left(\ell - \overline{p}_n\right) \leq C\overline{p}_n^{-1}$ give

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathfrak{S}_{pt}(y)\right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(\sum_{s=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js} + y\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n} \eta_{js}\right) D_{jt}}{n\sigma^4 V_{\Delta}(p)} \right\|_{3a} \\
&+ 2\left|1-y\right| \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{\left|K_{jp}\right|}{n\sigma^4 V_{\Delta}(p)} \left\| \left(\sum_{s=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js} + y \sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n} \eta_{js} \right) \right\|_{6a} \left\| D_{jt} - D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1} \right\|_{6a} \\
&\leq C\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{\overline{p}_n}{n} + \left(\frac{\overline{p}_n}{n}\right)^{1/2} \Theta_{6a}\left(\ell - \overline{p}_n\right) \right) \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathfrak{S}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a} \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js}\right) D_{jt}}{n\sigma^4 V_{\Delta}(p)} \right\|_{3a} \\
&+ 2\left|1-y\right| \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{\left|K_{jp}\right|}{n\sigma^4 V_{\Delta}(p)} \left\| \sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} \right\|_{6a} \left\| D_{jt} - D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1} \right\|_{6a} \\
&+ 2 \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{\left|K_{jp}\right|}{n\sigma^4 V_{\Delta}(p)} \left\| \sum_{s=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js} + y \sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} + \sum_{s=t+1}^{n} \eta_{js} \right\|_{6a} \left\| D_{jt} - D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1} \right\|_{6a} \\
&\leq C\left(\frac{\ell^{1/2}}{n} + \frac{\ell^{1/2}\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n}\Theta_{6a}\left(\ell - \overline{p}_n\right) + \left(\frac{\overline{p}_n}{n}\right)^{1/2} \Theta_{6a}\left(\ell - \overline{p}_n\right) \right) \\
&\leq C\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n} + \frac{1}{\left(n\overline{p}_n\right)^{1/2}} \right),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\left\|\mathfrak{T}_{pt}(y)\right\|_{3a} \leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n}, \quad \left\|\mathfrak{T}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a} \leq \frac{C}{n\overline{p}_n}.
$$

For $\left\|\mathbf{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a}$ (C.18), $\overline{p}_n = O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$ and the Burkholder inequality give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbf{s}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a} \\
&\le \left\| 2 \sum_{s_1=t-\ell}^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{K_{jp}}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)} \left(\sum_{s_2=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js_2} \right) D_{js_1} \right\|_{3a} + \left\| \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \left(\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js}\right)^2}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)} \right\|_{3a} \\
&+ \left\| \frac{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp} \left(\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js}\right)\left(\sum_{s=t+1}^{n} \eta_{js}\right)}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)} \right\|_{3a} \\
&\le C \left(\sum_{s_1=t-\ell}^{t-1} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{K_{jp}}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)} \left(\sum_{s_2=j+1}^{t-\ell-1} D_{js_2} \right) D_{js_1} \right\|_{3a}^2 \right)^{1/2} + C \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{|K_{jp}|}{n\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)} \left\| \sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} \right\|_{6a}^2 \\
&+ C \left\| \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}^2 \left(\sum_{s=t-\ell}^{t-1} D_{js} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}}{(np)^{1/2}} \right\|_{3a} \\
&\le C \left(\ell^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{\overline{p}_n}{n} \right) + \frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}\ell}{n} + \frac{\ell^{1/2}}{n^{1/2}} \right) \le C \left(\frac{\overline{p}_n}{n} \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

These bounds and (C.14) give, uniformly in y, p and t,

$$\begin{gathered}
\left\|\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a} \le \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}, \quad \left\|\mathbf{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1)}(y)\right\|_{3a} \le C\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n}{n}\right)^{1/2}, \\
\left\|\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(1,1)}(y)\right\|_{3a/2} \le C\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n} + \left(\frac{\overline{p}_n}{n}\right)^{3/2} + \frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{n\overline{p}_n^{1/2}} \right) \le C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n}.
\end{gathered}$$

Now, arguing as for the study of (C.29), $e = O\left(\overline{p}_n^{1/a}\right)$ give uniformly in p, t and y,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathfrak{J}_{1t}^{(1)}(y)\right|\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathfrak{J}_{2t}^{(1)}(y)\right|\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathfrak{J}_{4t}^{(1)}(y)\right|\right] \le C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2+3/a}}{n^{3/2}}, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathfrak{J}_{3t}^{(1)}(y)\right|\right] \le C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+3/a}}{n^{3/2}}.$$

It then follows $\sum_{t=1}^{n}\int_0^1 \left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{J}_t^{(1)}(y)\right]\right| dy \le C\overline{p}_n^{1+3/a}/n^{1/2}$. Since $\sum_{t=1}^{n}\int_0^1 \left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{J}_t^{(1)}(y;\eta_t)\right]\right| dy$ satisfies a similar bound, we have for (C.34),

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n} \left| \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{J}_t^{(1)}(y) - \mathfrak{J}_t^{(1)}(y;\eta_t) \right] dy \right| \le C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+3/a}}{n^{1/2}}.$$

Consider now (C.33). Since $D_{jt}^{t-\ell+1}$ and η_t are independent of the $\mathfrak{J}_{tn}^{(1)}(0)$, $\mathfrak{M}_t^{1-2e}(0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pt}(0)$, we have using (C.12),

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\mathfrak{J}_t(0)-\mathfrak{J}_t(0;\eta_t)\right]\\
&=\frac{4}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{e}-1\right)\mathfrak{J}_{tn}^{(1)}(0)\,\mathfrak{M}_t^{1-2e}(0)\right.\\
&\sum_{p_1,p_2=1}^{\overline{p}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p_1t}^{e-1}(0)\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p_2t}^{e-1}(0)\,f\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p_1t}^{e-1}(0)\right)f\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p_2t}^{e-1}(0)\right)\sum_{j_1=1}^{p_1}\sum_{j_2=1}^{p_2}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[D_{j_1t}^{t-\ell+1}D_{j_2t}^{t-\ell+1}\right]-\mathbb{E}\left[\eta_{j_1t}\eta_{j_2t}\right]\right)\\
&\left.\frac{K_{j_1p_1}\left(\sum_{s_1=j_1+1}^{t-\ell+1}D_{j_1s_1}+\sum_{s_1=t-\ell}^{n}\eta_{j_1s_1}\right)}{n^{1/2}\sigma^4V_\Delta(p_1)}\frac{K_{j_2p_2}\left(\sum_{s_2=j_2+1}^{t-\ell+1}D_{j_2s_2}+\sum_{s_2=t-\ell}^{n}\eta_{j_2s_2}\right)}{n^{1/2}\sigma^4V_\Delta(p_2)}\right]\\
&=0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence (C.33) and (C.34) give

$$
\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]\right|\leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+3/a}}{n^{1/2}}.
$$

To study $\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{2t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_{2t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]\right|$, observe that, uniformly with respect to p, t and y,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max\left(\left\|\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2)}(y)\right\|_{3a/2},\left\|\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2)}(y;\eta_t)\right\|_{3a/2}\right)&\leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/2}}{n},\\
\max\left(\left\|\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2,1)}(y)\right\|_{a},\left\|\widetilde{\Sigma}_{pt}^{(2,1)}(y;\eta_t)\right\|_{a}\right)&\leq C\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n}{n^{3/2}}+\frac{1}{n\overline{p}_n}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Arguing as for $\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_{1t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]$ gives $\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{2t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_{2t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]\right|\leq C\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+2/a}}{n^{1/2}}+\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1/a}}{\overline{p}_n}\right)$, and provided $e=O\left(\overline{p}_n^{1/(2a)}\right)$

$$
\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{3t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_{3t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]\right|+\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{4t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_{4t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]\right|\leq C\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+3/a}}{n^{1/2}}.
$$

It then follows

$$
\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}_{t}^{(2)}(0;D_t)-\mathcal{I}_{t}^{(2)}(0;\eta_t)\right]\right|\leq C\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+3/a}}{n^{1/2}}+\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n^{1-1/a}}\right).\tag{C.35}
$$

Substituting (C.32), (C.35) in (C.29), (C.28) shows that the Lemma is proved. □

C.6.3. *End of the proof of Proposition B.3.* The rest of the proof is divided in 3 steps.

Step 1: Martingale approximation. Let $\widetilde{S}_p$ and $\check{S}_p$ be as in (2.5) and (C.16) respectively. Let $\mathfrak{a} = 4a/3$. The Cauchy Schwarz inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\check{S}_p - \widetilde{S}_p\right| &= \sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(K_{jp}\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\left|M_{jn} - \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right| \times \frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\left|M_{jn} + \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right|\right)\\ &\leq C\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n}\left(M_{jn} - \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right)^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n}\left(M_{jn} + \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right)^2\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\check{S}_p - \widetilde{S}_p\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}/2}\\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n}\left(M_{jn} - \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2}}\right]\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n}\left(M_{jn} + \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2}}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Observe now that (C.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n}\left(M_{jn} - \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2}}\right]\\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathbb{E}^{\frac{2}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left|M_{jn} - \sum_{t=j+1}^{n} u_t u_{t-j}\right|^{\mathfrak{a}}\right]\right)^{1/2} \leq C\left(\frac{p}{n}\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the Burkholder inequality and $\max_j \mathbb{E}\left[|D_{jt}|^{\mathfrak{a}}\right] < \infty$ give $\max_{j\in[1,\overline{p}_n]} \mathbb{E}^{1/\mathfrak{a}}\left[|M_{jn}|^{\mathfrak{a}}\right] \leq Cn^{1/2}$, we also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n}\left(M_{jn}+\sum_{t=j+1}^{n}u_t u_{t-j}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2}}\right] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left|M_{jn}+\sum_{t=j+1}^{n}u_t u_{t-j}\right|^{\mathfrak{a}}\right]\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left(2\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[|M_{jn}|^{\mathfrak{a}}\right]+\mathbb{E}^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}}}\left[\left|\sum_{t=j+1}^{n}u_t u_{t-j}-M_{jn}\right|^{\mathfrak{a}}\right]\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{p(Cn^{1/2}+C)^2}{n}\right)^{1/2} \leq Cp^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

It then follows that $\left\|\check{S}_p - \widetilde{S}_p\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}/2} \leq Cp/n^{1/2}$ and them $\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\left(\check{S}_p - \widetilde{S}_p\right)/p^{1/2}\right|^{\mathfrak{a}/2}\right] \leq C\left(\overline{p}_n/n\right)^{\mathfrak{a}/4}$. Hence the Markov inequality gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\frac{\check{S}_p-\widetilde{S}_p}{p^{1/2}}\right|\geq t\right) &\leq \sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\check{S}_p-\widetilde{S}_p}{p^{1/2}}\right|\geq t\right) \\
&\leq \frac{\overline{p}_n}{t^{\mathfrak{a}/2}}\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{\check{S}_p-\widetilde{S}_p}{p^{1/2}}\right|^{\frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2}}\right] \leq \frac{C}{t^{a/2}}\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^{1+\frac{4}{\mathfrak{a}}}}{n}\right)^{\mathfrak{a}/4},
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\overline{p}_n = o\left(n^{1/(2(1+4/\mathfrak{a}))}\right)$ gives

$$
\max_{p\in[1,\overline{p}_n]}\left|\frac{\check{S}_p-\widetilde{S}_p}{p^{1/2}}\right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{C.36}
$$

Step 2: some Gaussian approximations. Let $\gamma_n' = \gamma_n\left(1+\epsilon/2\right)/\left(1+\epsilon\right)$. (3.1) gives $\gamma_n \geq \gamma_n' \geq \widetilde{\gamma}_n = \left(2\ln\ln\overline{p}_n\right)^{1/2}\left(1+\epsilon/3\right)$. Consider a three times continuously differentiable function $\iota\left(x\right)$ with $\max_{j=1,2,3}\sup_x\left|\iota^{(3)}\left(x\right)\right| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{I}\left(x\geq 0\right) \leq \iota\left(x\right) \leq \mathbb{I}\left(x\geq -\epsilon\right)$. Let $\mathcal{I}\left(x\right) = \iota\left(x-\gamma_n'\right)$. Let $\check{s}_p$ be as in (C.16). Then Lemma C.5 with $e = \overline{p}_n^{1/(2a)}$, (C.14) and

(C.16), and Assumption R give

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\check{s}_p\}\geq\gamma_n'\right)\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{M}\geq\gamma_n'\right)\leq\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}\left(\mathcal{M}\right)\right]$$
$$\leq\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{I}\left(\mathcal{M}_1\left(\eta_1\right)\right)\right]+o\left(1\right)\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{M}_1\left(\eta_1\right)\geq\gamma_n'-\epsilon\right)+o\left(1\right).$$

We now look for a more explicit expression for the RHS. Recall that $\mathcal{M}_1\left(\eta_1\right)=\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}f^e\left(\check{s}_{p1}\left(1;\eta_1\right)\right)\right)^{1/e}$. Consider $\Omega\left(p\right)=\left[\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_p\right]'$ where the ω_p's are i.i.d. standard normal variables,

$$\mathcal{K}\left(p\right)=\operatorname{Diag}\left(\left(1-j/n\right)K_{jp},j=1,\ldots,p\right),$$
$$\mathcal{C}_\eta\left(p\right)=\left[\operatorname{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1t},\eta_{j_2t}\right),j_1,j_2=1,\ldots,p\right],$$
$$\mathcal{V}_\eta\left(p\right)=\mathcal{C}_\eta^{1/2}\left(p\right)\mathcal{K}\left(p\right)\mathcal{C}_\eta^{1/2}\left(p\right),$$

and $\mathcal{D}_\eta\left(p\right)=\operatorname{Diag}\left(\left(1-j/n\right)K_{jp}\operatorname{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right),j=1,\ldots,p\right)$ the $p\times p$ diagonal matrix obtained from the diagonal entries of $\mathcal{V}_\eta\left(p\right)$. Then the $\check{s}_{p1}\left(1;\eta_1\right)$, $p=1,\ldots,\overline{p}_n$, have the same joint distribution than

$$\tilde{s}_p=\frac{\Omega\left(p\right)'\mathcal{V}_\eta\left(p\right)\Omega\left(p\right)-\sigma^4E_\Delta\left(p\right)}{\sigma^4V_\Delta\left(p\right)},\quad p=1,\ldots,\overline{p}_n,$$

so that $\mathcal{M}_1\left(\eta_1\right)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}=\left(\sum_{p=1}^{\overline{p}_n}f^e\left(\tilde{s}_p\right)\right)^{1/e}$ have the same distribution, and then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\check{s}_p\}\geq\gamma_n'\right)\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}\geq\gamma_n'-\epsilon\right)+o\left(1\right).$$

Define now

$$\bar{s}_p=\frac{\Omega\left(p\right)'\mathcal{D}_\eta\left(p\right)\Omega\left(p\right)-\sigma^4E_\Delta\left(p\right)}{\sigma^4V_\Delta\left(p\right)}=\frac{\sum_{j=1}^p\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)K_{jp}\operatorname{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right)\omega_j^2-\sigma^4E_\Delta\left(p\right)}{\sigma^4V_\Delta\left(p\right)}.$$

Then uniformly in $p=1,\ldots,\overline{p}_n$,

$$\left|\tilde{s}_p-\bar{s}_p\right|=\left|\frac{\Omega\left(p\right)'\left(\mathcal{V}_\eta\left(p\right)-\mathcal{D}_\eta\left(p\right)\right)\Omega\left(p\right)}{\sigma^4V_\Delta\left(p\right)}\right|$$
$$\leq C\sum_{1\leq j_1\neq j_2\leq\overline{p}_n}\left|\operatorname{Cov}\left(\eta_{j_1t},\eta_{j_2t}\right)\right|\left|\omega_{j_1}\right|\left|\omega_{j_2}\right|=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right),$$

by Lemma C.3. Hence since $f(x) \leq 2 \vee x$ by (C.14) and using (C.15),

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} &\leq \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\ln n}{\overline{p}_n^{1/(2a)}}\right)\right) \max_{p \in [2, \overline{p}_n]} \{2 \vee \tilde{s}_p\} \leq \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\ln n}{\overline{p}_n^{1/(2a)}}\right)\right) 2 \vee \max_{p \in [2, \overline{p}_n]} \{\tilde{s}_p\} \\
&\leq \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\ln n}{n^{1/8a}}\right)\right) \max_{p \in [2, \overline{p}_n]} \{\bar{s}_p\} + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Define now

$$\mathsf{V}_\Delta(p) = \left(2 \sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}^2\right)^{1/2}, \quad \mathsf{s}_p = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} K_{jp}\left(\omega_j^2 - 1\right)}{\mathsf{V}_\Delta(p)},$$

which is such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\bar{s}_p - \mathsf{s}_p| \leq |\mathfrak{e}_{1p}| + |\mathfrak{e}_{2p}| \text{ where} \\
&\mathfrak{e}_{1p} = \left(\frac{\sigma^4 \mathsf{V}_\Delta(p)}{\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)} - 1\right) \sigma^4 \mathsf{s}_p, \\
&\mathfrak{e}_{2p} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} \left\{\left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right) \operatorname{Var}(\eta_{jt}) - \sigma^4\right\} K_{jp}\omega_j^2 - \sigma^4 \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{j}{n} K_{jp}}{\sigma^4 V_\Delta(p)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $K'(\cdot)$ is continuous on $[0,1]$, the Weierstrass Theorem implies it can be uniformly approximated with a sequence of polynomial function. Hence (C.1), Assumption K and the LIL for weighted sums in Li and Tomkins (1996) gives that

$$\limsup_{p \to \infty} \frac{|\mathsf{V}_\Delta(p)\, \mathsf{s}_p|}{p^{1/2} (2 \ln \ln p)^{1/2}} \leq \left(2 \int K^4(t)\, dt\right)^{1/2}, \text{ almost surely.}$$

Since, under Assumption K, $\mathsf{V}_\Delta(p)/p^{1/2} \to \left(2 \int K^4(t)\, dt\right)^{1/2}$ by convergence of Riemann sums, this gives

$$\sup_{p \in [2, \overline{p}_n]} |\mathsf{s}_p| \leq (2 \ln \ln \overline{p}_n)^{1/2} (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)). \tag{C.37}$$

Observe also that Lemma B.1-(ii), $\overline{p}_n = o\left(n^{1/2}\right)$, and Assumption K give uniformly in $p \in [1, \overline{p}_n]$

$$\left|\frac{\mathsf{V}_\Delta(p)}{V_\Delta(p)} - 1\right| \leq C \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{j^2}{n^2} K_{jp}^2\right)^{1/2} = o\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right).$$

Hence

$$\max_{p \in [2, \overline{p}_n]} |\mathfrak{e}_{1p}| = o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\left(\frac{2 \ln \ln \overline{p}_n}{n}\right)^{1/2}\right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Now, for $\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}|\mathfrak{e}_{2p}|$, we have by Lemmas B.1-(ii) and C.3, $\overline{p}_n=o\left(n^{1/2}\right)$, and Assumption K,

$$\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}|\mathfrak{e}_{2p}|\leq C\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n}\left|\operatorname{Var}\left(\eta_{jt}\right)-\sigma^4\right|\omega_j^2+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{\overline{p}_n}j\omega_j^2+\frac{\overline{p}_n^{3/2}}{n}\right\}=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)+O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{\overline{p}_n^2}{n}\right)=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right).$$

Hence $\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}|\bar{s}_p-\mathsf{s}_p|=O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)$ and substituting in the bounds for $\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\check{s}_p\}\geq\gamma_n'\right)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ above gives, by (3.1), $\gamma_n'=\gamma_n\left(1+\epsilon/2\right)/\left(1+\epsilon\right)$, $\gamma_n'\geq\left(2\ln\ln\overline{p}_n\right)^{1/2}\left(1+\epsilon/3\right)$ and (C.37)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\check{s}_p\}\geq\gamma_n'\right)&=\mathbb{P}\left(\left(1+O\left(\frac{\ln n}{n^{1/8a}}\right)\right)\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\mathsf{s}_p\}+O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)\geq\gamma_n'-\epsilon\right)+o\left(1\right)\\&\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\mathsf{s}_p\}\geq\left(2\ln\ln\overline{p}_n\right)^{1/2}\left(1+\epsilon/3\right)\right)+o\left(1\right)\\&=o\left(1\right).\end{aligned}\tag{C.38}$$

Step 3: Conclusion. Propositions B.2 and B.1, Lemma B.1 and $\overline{p}_n=O\left(n^{1/2}\right)$, the expression of $\check{S}_p$ and $\check{s}_p$ in (C.16) and (C.36) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\frac{\left(\widehat{S}_p-\widehat{S}_1\right)/\widehat{R}_0^2-E_\Delta\left(p\right)}{V_\Delta\left(p\right)}=\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\frac{\left(\widehat{S}_p-\widehat{S}_1\right)-\widehat{R}_0^2E_\Delta\left(p\right)}{\widehat{R}_0^2V_\Delta\left(p\right)}\\&=\left(1+o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)\right)\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\frac{\left(\widetilde{S}_p-\widetilde{S}_1\right)-R_0^2E_\Delta\left(p\right)}{R_0^2V_\Delta\left(p\right)}+O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1+\overline{p}_n^{1/2}\left(\widehat{R}_0^2-R_0^2\right)\right)\\&=\left(1+o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right)\right)\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\check{s}_p\}+O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(1\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence (C.38) gives, since $\gamma_n-\gamma_n'\to+\infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\frac{\left(\widehat{S}_p-\widehat{S}_1\right)/\widehat{R}_0^2-E_\Delta\left(p\right)}{V_\Delta\left(p\right)}\geq\gamma_n\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{p\in[2,\overline{p}_n]}\{\check{s}_p\}\geq\gamma_n'\right)+o\left(1\right)=o\left(1\right).$$

This ends the proof of the Proposition. $\square$

C.7. **Proof of Propositions B.4 and B.5.** When studying the mean and variance of $\widetilde{S}_p$, we make use of Theorem 2.3.2 in Brillinger (2001) which implies in particular that, for any real zero-mean random variables $Z_1, \ldots, Z_4$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Var}\left(Z_1 Z_2, Z_3 Z_4\right) = \operatorname{Var}(Z_1, Z_3) \operatorname{Var}(Z_2, Z_4) + \operatorname{Var}(Z_1, Z_4) \operatorname{Var}(Z_2, Z_3) \\ &+ \operatorname{Cum}\left(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\right). \end{aligned} \tag{C.39}$$

Note that Assumption R and Theorem C.1 imply that

$$\sup_{n, q \in [2,8]} \sum_{t_2, \ldots, t_q = -\infty}^{\infty} \left| \Gamma_n\left(0, t_2, \ldots, t_q\right) \right| < \infty. \tag{C.40}$$

C.7.1. ***Proof of Proposition B.4***. (C.39) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{R}_j^2\right] &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t_1, t_2 = 1}^{n-j} \mathbb{E}\left[u_{t_1} u_{t_1+j} u_{t_2} u_{t_2+j}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{t_1, t_2 = 1}^{n-j} \left(R_j^2 + R_{t_2 - t_1}^2 + R_{t_2 - t_1 + j} R_{t_2 - t_1 - j} + \Gamma\left(0, j, t_2 - t_1, t_2 - t_1 + j\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t_1, t_2 = 1}^{n-j} R_{t_2 - t_1}^2 &= (n-j) R_0^2 + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-j-1} (n - j - \ell) R_\ell^2, \\ \sum_{t_1, t_2 = 1}^{n-j} R_{t_2 - t_1 + j} R_{t_2 - t_1 - j} &= (n-j) R_j^2 + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-j-1} (n - j - \ell) R_{\ell+j} R_{\ell-j}, \\ \sum_{t_1, t_2 = 1}^{n-j} \Gamma\left(0, j, t_2 - t_1, t_2 - t_1 + j\right) &= \sum_{\ell = -n+j+1}^{n-j-1} (n - j - |\ell|) \Gamma\left(0, j, \ell, \ell + j\right). \end{aligned}$$

Set $k_j = K^2\left(j/p\right)$ to prove the first equality and $k_j = K^2\left(j/p\right)/\tau_j^2$ for the second. Note that Assumptions K and R give, in both case, $\max_{j \in [1, n-1]} k_j \leq C$ and $k_j \geq C \mathbb{I}\left(j \leq p/2\right)$. The equalities above give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \widetilde{R}_j^2\right] - R_0^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right) k_j \\
&= n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{n}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)\right) k_j R_j^2 \qquad \text{(C.41)} \\
&+ 2\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-j-1}\left(1-\frac{j+\ell}{n}\right)\left(R_\ell^2 + R_{\ell+j}R_{\ell-j}\right) \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \sum_{\ell=-n+j+1}^{n-j-1}\left(1-\frac{j+|\ell|}{n}\right)\Gamma\left(0,j,\ell,\ell+j\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We start with the item $R_0^2\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)k_j$, which is equal to $R_0^2 E\left(p\right)$ when $k_j = K^2\left(j/p\right)$, that is when proving the first equality. When $k_j = K^2\left(j/p\right)/\tau_j^2$, (B.3) gives, under Assumptions K and R,

$$\left|R_0^2\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(1-\frac{j}{n}\right)k_j - E\left(p\right)\right| \leq C\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left|\tau_j^2 - R_0^2\right| \leq C\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-6}$$

so that $R_0^2\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\left(1-j/n\right)k_j \geq E\left(p\right) - C'$.

Let us now turn to the other items. The lower bound$k_j \geq CI(j \leq p/2)$ gives that (C.41) is larger than $Cn\sum_{j=1}^{p/2} R_j^2$. To bound the remaining terms in (C.41), we note that by Assumptions K, R and (C.40),

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-j-1}\left(1-\frac{j+\ell}{n}\right)R_\ell^2\right| \leq C\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\mathbb{I}(j\leq p)\times\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}R_j^2 \leq Cp\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}R_j^2 = o(n)\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}R_j^2,$$

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-j-1}\left(1-\frac{j+\ell}{n}\right)R_{\ell+j}R_{\ell-j}\right| \leq C\sum_{j=1}^{+\infty}\sum_{\ell=1}^{+\infty}\left|R_{\ell+j}R_{\ell-j}\right| \leq C\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}|R_j|\right)^2 \leq C,$$

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \sum_{\ell=-n+j+1}^{n-j-1}\left(1-\frac{j+\ell}{n}\right)\Gamma\left(0,j,\ell,\ell+j\right)\right| \leq C\sum_{t_2,t_3,t_4=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,t_2,t_3,t_4)\right| \leq C$$

uniformly with respect to $p \in [1,\overline{p}_n]$. Substituting these bounds in the equality above establishes the proposition. □

C.7.2. ***Proof of Proposition B.5***. Let f be the spectral density of the alternative. Using (C.40), we obtain

$$\sup_{\lambda\in[-\pi,\pi]} |f(\lambda)| \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} R_j^2 \leq C \tag{C.42}$$

because $\sup_{\lambda\in[-\pi,\pi]} |f(\lambda)| \leq \left(|R_0| + 2\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|R_j|\right)/(2\pi)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} R_j^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|R_j|\right)^2$. We recall that $\widetilde{R}_j = \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} u_t u_{t+j}/n$ and define $\overline{R}_j = \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{R}_j\right] = (1-j/n)R_j$. Set $k_j = K^2(j/p)$ to prove the first equality and $k_j = K^2(j/p)/\tau_j^2$ for the second. Note that Assumptions K and R give, in both case, $k_j \leq C\mathbb{I}(j\leq p)$. To avoid notation burdens, redefine $\widetilde{S}_p$ as $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \widetilde{R}_j^2$. Define $D_j = \widetilde{R}_j - \overline{R}_j$. We have $\mathbb{E}[D_j] = 0$ and $\widetilde{S}_p = n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \overline{R}_j^2 + 2n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \overline{R}_j D_j + n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j D_j^2$. The inequality $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ implies that

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\widetilde{S}_p\right) \leq 4\operatorname{Var}\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \overline{R}_j \widetilde{R}_j\right) + 2\operatorname{Var}\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j D_j^2\right). \tag{C.43}$$

By identity (C.39),

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \overline{R}_j \widetilde{R}_j\right) = \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\overline{R}_{j_1}\overline{R}_{j_2} \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} \operatorname{Cov}\left(u_{t_1}u_{t_1+j_1}, u_{t_2}u_{t_2+j_2}\right) \leq V_1 + K_1$$

with

$$V_1 = \left|\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\overline{R}_{j_1}\overline{R}_{j_2} \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} \left(R_{t_2-t_1}R_{t_2-t_1+j_2-j_1} + R_{t_2-t_1-j_1}R_{t_2-t_1+j_2}\right)\right|,$$

$$K_1 = \left|\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\overline{R}_{j_1}\overline{R}_{j_2} \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} \Gamma\left(t_1, t_1+j_1, t_2, t_2+j_2\right)\right|.$$

The second term on the right of (C.43) is, up to a multiplicative constant, equal to

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j D_j^2\right) = n^2 \sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\operatorname{Cov}\left(D_{j_1}^2, D_{j_2}^2\right).$$

Applying (C.39) twice we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Cov}\left(D_{j_1}^2, D_{j_2}^2\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2} \operatorname{Cov}\left[\prod_{q=1}^{2}\left(u_{t_q}u_{t_q+j_1} - \mathbb{E}[u_{t_q}u_{t_q+j_1}]\right), \prod_{q=3}^{4}\left(u_{t_q}u_{t_q+j_2} - \mathbb{E}[u_{t_q}u_{t_q+j_2}]\right)\right]\\
&= \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2} \left[\operatorname{Cov}\left(u_{t_1}u_{t_1+j_1}, u_{t_3}u_{t_3+j_2}\right)\operatorname{Cov}\left(u_{t_2}u_{t_2+j_1}, u_{t_4}u_{t_4+j_2}\right)\right.\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\left. + \operatorname{Cov}\left(u_{t_1}u_{t_1+j_1}, u_{t_4}u_{t_4+j_2}\right)\operatorname{Cov}\left(u_{t_2}u_{t_2+j_1}, u_{t_3}u_{t_3+j_2}\right)\right]\\
&+ \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2} \operatorname{Cum}\left(u_{t_1}u_{t_1+j_1}, u_{t_2}u_{t_2+j_1}, u_{t_3}u_{t_3+j_2}, u_{t_4}u_{t_4+j_2}\right)\\
&= \frac{2}{n^4}\left(\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2}\left(R_{t_2-t_1}R_{t_2-t_1+j_2-j_1} + R_{t_2-t_1-j_1}R_{t_2-t_1+j_2} + \Gamma(t_1, t_1+j_1, t_2, t_2+j_2)\right)\right)^2\\
&+ \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2} \operatorname{Cum}\left(u_{t_1}u_{t_1+j_1}, u_{t_2}u_{t_2+j_1}, u_{t_3}u_{t_3+j_2}, u_{t_4}u_{t_4+j_2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(a+b+c)^2 \leq 3(a^2+b^2+c^2)$, we can write $\operatorname{Var}\left(n\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j D_j^2\right) \leq 6V_2 + K_2 + 6K_2'$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
V_2 &= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\left(\left(\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} R_{t_2-t_1}R_{t_2-t_1+j_2-j_1}\right)^2 + \left(\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} R_{t_2-t_1-j_1}R_{t_2-t_1+j_2}\right)^2\right),\\
K_2 &= \left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\operatorname{Cum}\left(u_{t_1}u_{t_1+j_1}, u_{t_2}u_{t_2+j_1}, u_{t_3}u_{t_3+j_2}, u_{t_4}u_{t_4+j_2}\right)\right|,\\
K_2' &= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\left(\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma\left(t_1, t_1+j_1, t_2, t_2+j_2\right)\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting in (C.43) shows that the proposition holds if the following inequalities hold:

$$V_1 \leq Cn\sum_{j=1}^{p} R_j^2, \quad V_2 \leq Cp, \quad K_1 \leq C, \quad K_2' \leq C, \quad K_2 \leq C\frac{p^2}{n}.$$

We establish these inequalities in five steps.

Step 1: bound for V_1. We note that $|\overline{R}_j| \leq |R_j|$ and that under Assumption K, $0 \leq k_j \leq C$ for all j. Using a covariance spectral representation $R_j = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(\pm ij\lambda) f(\lambda) d\lambda$, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (C.42), we obtain by Assumption K

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{j_1, j_2 = 1}^{n-1} k_{j_1} k_{j_2} \overline{R}_{j_1} \overline{R}_{j_2} \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} R_{t_2 - t_1} R_{t_2 - t_1 + j_2 - j_1} \right| \\
&= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \overline{R}_j \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \mathrm{e}^{it\lambda_1} \mathrm{e}^{i(t+j)\lambda_2} \right|^2 f(\lambda_1) f(\lambda_2) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \\
&\leq \left(\sup_{\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi]} |f(\lambda)| \right)^2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sum_{j_1, j_2 = 1}^{n-1} k_{j_1} \overline{R}_{j_1} k_{j_2} \overline{R}_{j_2} \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} \mathrm{e}^{it_1\lambda_1} \mathrm{e}^{i(t_1+j_1)\lambda_2} \mathrm{e}^{-it_2\lambda_1} \mathrm{e}^{-i(t_2+j_2)\lambda_2} d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \\
&\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (n-j) k_j^2 \overline{R}_j^2 \leq Cn \sum_{j=1}^{p} R_j^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{j_1, j_2 = 1}^{n-1} k_{j_1} k_{j_2} \overline{R}_{j_1} \overline{R}_{j_2} \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} R_{t_2 - t_1 - j_1} R_{t_2 - t_1 + j_2} \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1} \overline{R}_{j_1} \sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1} \mathrm{e}^{-i(t_1+j_1)\lambda_1} \mathrm{e}^{-it_1\lambda_2} \times \sum_{j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_2} \overline{R}_{j_2} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} \mathrm{e}^{it_2\lambda_1} \mathrm{e}^{i(t_2+j_2)} f(\lambda_1) f(\lambda_2) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \right| \\
&\leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \overline{R}_j \sum_{t=1}^{n-j} \mathrm{e}^{it\lambda_1} \mathrm{e}^{i(t+j)\lambda_2} \right|^2 f(\lambda_1) f(\lambda_2) d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 \leq Cn \sum_{j=1}^{p} R_j^2
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes the bound for V_1.

Step 2: bound for V_2. We define $t_2 = t_1 + t_2'$, $j_2 = j_1 + j_2'$. By Assumption K and by (C.40),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 = 1}^{n-1} k_{j_1} k_{j_2} \left(\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1} \sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} R_{t_2 - t_1} R_{t_2 - t_1 - j_1 + j_2} \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} K^2(j_1/p) \sum_{j_2\prime = -\infty}^{\infty} \left(n \sum_{t_2\prime = -\infty}^{+\infty} |R_{t_2\prime} R_{t_2\prime + j_2\prime}| \right)^2 \\
&\leq Cp \times \left(\sum_{j_2, t_1, t_2 = -\infty}^{\infty} |R_{t_1} R_{t_1 + j_2} R_{t_2} R_{t_2 + j_2}| \right) \leq Cp \left(\sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} |R_t| \right)^4 \leq Cp,
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\left(\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2} R_{t_2-t_1-j_1}R_{t_2-t_1+j_2}\right)^2 \\
&\le \frac{C}{n^2}\sum_{j_1=1}^{n-1} K^2(j_1/p)\sum_{j_{2\prime}=-\infty}^{\infty}\left(n\sum_{t_{2\prime}=-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|R_{t_{2\prime}-j_1}R_{t_{2\prime}+j_1+j_{2\prime}}\right|\right)^2 \\
&\le Cp\sum_{j_2',t_1,t_2=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|R_{t_1-j_1}R_{t_1+j_1+j_2'}R_{t_2-j_1}R_{t_2+j_1+j_2'}\right| \le Cp\sum_{j,t_1,t_2=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|R_{t_1}R_{t_1+j}R_{t_2}R_{t_2+j}\right| \\
&\le Cp\left(\sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty}|R_t|\right)^4 \le Cp,
\end{aligned}
$$

therefore $V_2 \le Cp$.

Step 3: bound for K_1. Define $t_2 = t_1 + t$. Assumption K, and (C.40) yield

$$
K_1 \le C\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{p}\sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,j_1,t,t+j_2)\right| \le \sum_{t_1,t_2,t_3=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,t_1,t_2,t_3)\right|.
$$

Step 4: bound for K_2'. (C.40) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_2' &\le \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\left(\sum_{t_1=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_2=1}^{n-j_2}\left|\Gamma\left(0,j_1,t_2-t_1,t_2-t_1+j_2\right)\right|\right)^2 \\
&\le C\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{+\infty}\left(\sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,j_1,t,t+j_2)\right|\right)^2 \\
&= C\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{+\infty}\sum_{t_1,t_2=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,j_1,t_1,t_1+j_2)\Gamma(0,j_1,t_2,t_2+j_2)\right| \\
&\le C\left(\sum_{t_2,t_3,t_4=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,t_2,t_3,t_4)\right|\right)^2 \le C.
\end{aligned}
$$

Step 5: bound for K_2. Bounding K_2 requires additional notation. First set $t_5 = t_1 + j_1$, $t_6 = t_2 + j_1$, $t_7 = t_3 + j_2$ and $t_8 = t_4 + j_2$, and note that $t_5, \ldots, t_8$ depend upon $t_1, \ldots, t_4$ and j_1, j_2 only. For a partition $B = \{B_\ell, \ell = 1, \ldots, d_B\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, 8\}$, define $d_B = \operatorname{Card} B$, $\Gamma_B(t_1, \ldots, t_8) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{d_B} \operatorname{Cum}\left(u_{t_q}, q \in B_\ell\right)$, and recall that $\operatorname{Cum}(u_t) = Eu_t = 0$. Then the largest d_B yielding a non-vanishing Γ_B is $d_B = 4$. When $d_B = 4$, B is a pairwise partition of $\{1,\ldots,8\}$ so that Γ_B is a product of covariances. Let B be the set of indecomposable partitions of the two-way table

$$\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 5 \\ 2 & 6 \\ 3 & 7 \\ 4 & 8 \end{array},$$

see Brillinger (2001, p. 20) for a definition. Then according to Brillinger (2001, Theorem 2.3.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Cum}\left(u_{t_1}u_{t_1+j_1}, u_{t_2}u_{t_2+j_1}, u_{t_3}u_{t_3+j_2}, u_{t_4}u_{t_4+j_2}\right) \\
&\quad = \sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}} \Gamma_B(t_1,\ldots,t_8) = \sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}, d_B\leq 3} \Gamma_B(t_1,\ldots,t_8) + \sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}, d_B=4} \Gamma_B(t_1,\ldots,t_8).
\end{aligned}$$

Some properties of partitions in $\mathcal{B}$ are as follows. Call $\{1,5\}$, $\{2,6\}$, $\{3,7\}$ and $\{4,8\}$ fundamental pairs and say that a B_1 in a partition B breaks the pair $\{1,5\}$ if $\{1,5\}$ is not a subset of B_1. Then partitions $B\in\mathcal{B}$ are such that each $B_\ell\in B$ must break a fundamental pair. Note that fundamental pairs play a symmetric role. Since $t_{q+4}-t_q$ is j_1 or j_2 with vanishing k_{j_1} or k_{j_2} if j_1 or j_2 is larger than p, the indexes t_q and t_{q+4} of a fundamental pair also play a symmetric role in the computations below. We now discuss the contribution to K_2 of partitions of $\{1,\ldots,8\}$ according to the possible values $1,\ldots,4$ of d_B. Due to symmetry, we only consider representative partitions for each case.

Under Assumption K and (C.40), the case $d_B = 1$ gives a contribution to K_2 bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2} \sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2} \Gamma\left(t_1,\ldots,t_8\right)\right| &\leq \frac{C}{n^2}\sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_8=-n}^{n} \left|\Gamma\left(0, t_2-t_1,\ldots,t_8-t_1\right)\right| \\
&\leq \frac{C}{n}\sum_{t_2',\ldots,t_8'=-\infty}^{\infty} \left|\Gamma\left(0, t_2',\ldots,t_8'\right)\right| \leq \frac{C}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The case $d_B = 2$ corresponds to $\{\operatorname{Card} B_1, \operatorname{Card} B_2\}$ being $\{2,6\}$, $\{3,5\}$ or $\{4,4\}$. These cases are very similar and we limit ourselves to $\{2,6\}$ and $B_1 = \{1,2\}$. The corresponding contribution to K_2 is bounded by

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma_B(t_1,\dots,t_8)\right| \le \frac{C}{n^2}\sum_{t_1,\dots,t_8=-n}^{n}\left|\Gamma(0,t_2-t_1)\Gamma(t_3-t_1,\dots,t_8-t_1)\right|$$

$$\le \frac{C}{n}\sum_{t'_2,\dots,t'_8=-n}^{n}\left|\Gamma(0,t'_2)\Gamma(t'_3,\dots,t'_8)\right| \le \frac{C}{n}\sum_{t=-n}^{n}|R_t|\sum_{t'_3,\dots,t'_8=-n}^{n}\left|\Gamma(0,t'_4-t'_3,\dots,t'_8-t'_3)\right|$$

$$C\sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty}|R_t|\sum_{t_2,\dots,t_6=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,t_2,\dots,t_6)\right| \le C,$$

by Assumption K and (C.40).

The case $d_B = 3$ corresponds to $\{\operatorname{Card} B_1, \operatorname{Card} B_2, \operatorname{Card} B_3\}$ being $\{2,2,4\}$ or $\{2,3,3\}$. We start with $\operatorname{Card} B_1 = 2$, $\operatorname{Card} B_2 = 2$ and $\operatorname{Card} B_3 = 4$. The discussion concerns the number of fundamental pair broken by B_3. Note that the situation where B_3 breaks only 3 or 1 fundamental pair is impossible. The case where B_3 does not break any fundamental pairs corresponds to partitions that are not indecomposable, so that the only possible cases are those where B_3 breaks 4 or 2 fundamental pairs.

- B_3 breaks 4 fundamental pairs. Consider $B_3 = \{1,2,3,4\}$, $B_2 = \{5,6\}$ and $B_3 = \{7,8\}$. The corresponding contribution to K_2 is bounded by

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma_B(t_1,\dots,t_8)\right|$$

$$= \left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma(0,t_2-t_1,t_3-t_1,t_4-t_1)R_{t_2-t_1}R_{t_4-t_3}\right|$$

$$\le C\frac{p^2}{n}\sup_j|R_j|^2\sum_{t_2,t_3,t_4=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma(0,t_2,t_3,t_4)\right| \le C\frac{p^2}{n}$$

  by Assumption K and (C.40).

- B_3 breaks 2 fundamental pairs. Take $B_3 = \{1,2,3,5\}$, $B_2 = \{4,6\}$ and $B_1 = \{7,8\}$. The change of variables $t_2 = t'_2 + t_1$, $t_3 = t'_3 + t_1$ and $t_4 = t'_4 + t_3$ shows that contribution to K_2 is bounded by

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma_B\left(t_1,\ldots,t_8\right)\right|$$

$$=\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma\left(0,t_2-t_1,t_3-t_1,j_1\right)R_{t_4-t_2-j_1}R_{t_4-t_3}\right|$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{n}\sum_{j_2=1}^{n-1}K^2(j_2/p)\sum_{t_2',t_3',j_1=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma\left(0,t_2',t_3',j_1\right)\right|\sum_{t_4'=-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|R_{t_4'}\right|\times\sup_j\left|R_j\right|\leq C\frac{p}{n}.$$

under Assumption K and (C.40).

We now turn to the case $\operatorname{Card}B_3=\operatorname{Card}B_2=3$ and $\operatorname{Card}B_1=2$. Observe that B_3 or B_2 must break 3 or 1 fundamental pair. The discussion now concerns the fundamental pairs which are simultaneously broken by B_3 and B_2. Note that B_3 and B_2 cannot break the same 3 fundamental pairs because if it did, B_1 would be given by the remaining fundamental pair in which case B_1 cannot communicate with B_2 or B_3, a fact that would contradict the requirement that the partition $\{B_1,B_2,B_3\}$ is indecomposable.

- B_3 and B_2 break 3 fundamental pairs, 2 of which are the same. Take $B_3=\{1,2,3\}$, $B_2=\{4,5,6\}$ and $B_1=\{7,8\}$. Using change of variables $t_2=t_1+t_2'$, $t_3=t_1+t_3'$ and $t_4=t_3+t_4'$, we can see that under Assumption K and (C.40) the contribution to K_2 of this case is bounded by

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma_B\left(t_1,\ldots,t_8\right)\right|$$

$$=\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma\left(0,t_2-t_1,t_3-t_1\right)\Gamma\left(0,t_1-t_4+j_1,t_2-t_4+j_1\right)R_{t_4-t_3}\right|$$

$$\leq\frac{C}{n}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1}K^2(j_1/p)K^2(j_2/p)\sup_{t_2,t_3}\left|\Gamma(0,t_2,t_3)\right|\sum_{t_2',t_3'=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|\Gamma\left(0,t_2',t_3'\right)\right|\sum_{t_4'=-\infty}^{+\infty}\left|R_{t_4'}\right|\leq C\frac{p^2}{n}$$

Note that the case where B_3 and B_2 break 3 fundamental pairs with less than one in common is impossible.

The next case assumes that B_2 breaks only 1 fundamental pair, which is also necessarily broken by B_3 since B_2 must contain the remaining unbroken pair.

- B_3 breaks 3 fundamental pairs and B_2 breaks only 1 pair. Take $B_3 = \{1,2,3\}$, $B_2 = \{4,5,8\}$ and $B_3 = \{6,7\}$ and consider a change of variables $t_2 = t_1 + t_2'$, $t_3 = t_1 + t_3'$ and $t_4 = t_1 + j_1 - t_4'$. Under Assumption K and (C.40), the contribution of this term to K_2 is bounded by

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma_B\left(t_1,\ldots,t_8\right)\right|$$

$$=\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma\left(0,t_2-t_1,t_3-t_1\right)\Gamma\left(t_1-t_4+j_1,0,j_2\right)R_{t_3-t_2+j_2-j_1}\right|$$

$$\leq \frac{C\sup_j|R_j|}{n}\sum_{j_1}^{n-1}K^2(j_1/p)\sum_{t_2',t_3'=-\infty}^{\infty}|\Gamma(0,t_2',t_3')|\sum_{t_4',j_2=-\infty}^{\infty}|\Gamma\left(t_4',0,j_2\right)|\leq C\frac{p}{n}.$$

- B_3 and B_2 break only 1 pair. Note that B_3 and B_2 cannot break the same pair because B_1 must be the remaining pair and cannot communicate, so that the partition is not indecomposable. Hence all the partitions in this case are similar to $B_3 = \{1,2,5\}$, $B_2 = \{3,4,8\}$, $B_1 = \{6,7\}$. The change of variable $t_2 = t_1 + t_2'$, $t_3 = -j_2 + t_2 + j_1 + t_3'$ and $t_4 = t_3 - t_4'$ yields a contribution to K_2 bounded by

$$\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma_B\left(t_1,\ldots,t_8\right)\right|$$

$$=\left|\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j_1,j_2=1}^{n-1} k_{j_1}k_{j_2}\sum_{t_1,t_2=1}^{n-j_1}\sum_{t_3,t_4=1}^{n-j_2}\Gamma\left(0,t_2-t_1,j_1\right)\Gamma\left(t_3-t_4,0,j_2\right)R_{t_3-t_2+j_2-j_1}\right|$$

$$\leq C\sum_{j_1,t_2'=-\infty}^{\infty}|\Gamma(0,t_2',j_1)|\sum_{j_2,t_4'=-\infty}^{\infty}|\Gamma(t_4,0,j_2)|\sum_{t_3'=-\infty}^{\infty}\left|R_{t_3'}\right|\leq C.\square$$

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

BRILLINGER, D.R. (2001). *Time Series Analysis: Data Analysis and Theory* . Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New-York.

CHOW, Y.S. and H. TEICHER (1988). *Probability Theory. Independence, Interchangeability, Martingales* . Second Edition, Springer.

LI, D. and R.J. TOMKINS (1996). Laws of the Iterated Logarithm for Weighted Independent Random Variables. *Statitiscs and Probability Letters* **27**, 247–254.

PRIESTLEY, M.B. (1981). *Spectral Analysis and Time Series.* New York: John Wiley.